Daily Report

Near East & South Asia

FBIS-NES-91-202
Friday
18 October 1991

Daily Report
Near East & South Asia

FBIS-NES-91-202 18 October 1991

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Inter-Arab Affairs

Arab League Official—Iraq To Free POW's 'Soon' *[MENA]* 1
PLO's Qaddumi To Visit Damascus 18 Oct *[MENA]* 1

Islamic Affairs

ICO Head on Common Market, Soviet Republics *[Istanbul TURKIYE 10 Oct]* 1

Palestinian Affairs

Central Council To Discuss Joint Delegation, Charter *[AL-NAHAR 17 Oct]* 1
Approves Conference Participation *[Paris Radio Monte Carlo]* 2
Delegation List Said Not Finalized *[Tunis Radio]* 2
'Arafat To Visit Syria Within 'Hours' *[Rabat Radio]* 3
Jordan, Egypt on Itinerary 3
Nusaybah Comments on Talks With Baker *[AL-FAJR 17 Oct]* 3
'Arafat Says Fatah Has Bodies of Three Israelis *[AL-FAJR 17 Oct]* 4

ARAB AFRICA

Algeria

Prime Minister Comments on New Cabinet *[Algiers TV]* 5
Presidential Decree Issued on Election Dates *[Algiers Radio]* 5

Egypt

Foreign Minister Comments on Peace Conference *[MENA]* 5
Al-Qadhdhafi Departs After Talks With Mubarak *[MENA]* 5
Israel Said Tracking Shipment of Scuds to Syria *[MENA]* 5
Israeli Attack Plan Reported *[MISR AL-FATAH 14 Oct]* 6
Israel 'Responsible' for Iran's Nuclear Program *[AL-AHRAM 13 Oct]* 6
Reportage on Mubarak Visit to Germany *[cross-reference]* 6

Libya

Al-Qadhdhafi Receives Al-Asad Message 13 Oct *[Damascus Radio]* 6
Diplomatic Relations Established With Indonesia *[JANA]* 7

Morocco

Importance of Parliament Session Stressed *[MAP]* 7
Syrian Vice President Khaddam Arrives on Visit *[Rabat Radio]* 7
Delivers Message to King Hassan *[Damascus Radio]* 7
Jordan's Prince Hasan Speaks at Academy *[JORDAN TIMES 16 Oct]* 7
Reportage on Filali Visit to Mexico *[cross-reference]* 9

IRAQ

Talabani Alleges 'Large-Scale' Attacks on Kurds *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 10 Oct]* 10
Writer Sees 'National Duty' To Support Saddam *[AL-JUMHURIYAH 12 Oct]* 13
Rebels Report Reduced Ba'th Party Influence *[Voice of Rebellious Iraq]* 16

ISRAEL

Reports on Talks With U.S. Secretary of State 17
'Significant Progress' Seen *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 17
Shamir: Some Questions 'Remain Open' *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 17
Shamir: 'Formidable' Problems in Talks *[Jerusalem Radio]* 17
Levi: 'No Doubt' About Shamir 'Yes' *[Jerusalem Radio]* 18
Shoval: 'Will Attend Conference' *[Jerusalem Radio]* 18
U.S. Letter of Assurances Detailed *[Jerusalem Radio]* 19
Palestinians Hold Contacts During Baker Visit 20
Meet With USSR's Pankin *[Jerusalem Radio]* 20
'Surprises' in Palestinian List *[Jerusalem TV]* 20
News Briefing on Baker Talks *[Jerusalem Radio]* 21
'Disaster' If Israel Sees Names *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 22
Soviet Foreign Minister Pankin Arrives *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 22
Pankin, Levi Statements *[Jerusalem Radio]* 22
Joint Statement After Meeting *[Jerusalem Radio]* 23
Pankin Urged To Press Syria *[Jerusalem TV]* 23
Levi Speaks at Banquet *[Jerusalem TV]* 23
Pankin Responds *[Jerusalem TV]* 24
Aide Churkin on Renewed Ties *[Jerusalem Radio]* 24
Shamir, Right-Wing Parties Confer on Conference *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 25
Arens Sees Two Questions in Baker Talks *[Jerusalem Radio]* 26
Netanyahu Doubts Syrian Intentions on Peace *[Jerusalem TV]* 27

JORDAN

U.S. Assurances on Settlements, Jerusalem Wanted *[Paris Radio Monte Carlo]* 29
Cabinet Reviews Talks *[PETRA-JNA]* 29
Baker Should 'Stop Appeasement' *[SAWT AL-SHA'B 18 Oct]* 29
Soviet Foreign Minister To Visit 20-21 Oct *[AFP]* 30
Spain's Ordonez Pays 1-Day Visit, Holds Talks *[Amman Radio]* 30
Media Urged To Help Improve Relations With Gulf *[PETRA-JNA]* 30

LEBANON

Statement Denies Request for Meeting With Baker *[Beirut Radio]* 31
Details of U.S. Letter of Assurances Revealed *[London AL-HAYAH 16 Oct]* 31
Fadlallah Will Meet Iran's Hashemi-Rafsanjani *[VOL]* 31
Hizballah Radio Reports Israeli Shelling *[Voice of the Oppressed]* 31
Junblatt Leaves for Tehran Palestinian Conference *[VOM]* 31

SYRIA

Baker, Al-Shar' Hold News Conference 16 Oct *[Damascus TV]* 32
'Full Text' of U.S. Assurances to Damascus Cited *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 15 Oct]* 34
Al-Asad, Lebanon's Al-Hirawi Chair Joint Council *[Damascus Radio]* 35

SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan

Hekmatyar's Faction Opposes Talks With Moscow *[AFP]* 36
Threatens Red Cross Over U.S. Hostages *[Lahore THE NATION 16 Oct]* 36

India

Rao, Sharif Hold Long Private Talks *[Delhi Radio]* 36
Pakistan Asked To Stop Aiding Kashmir Militants *[Delhi Radio]* 36
Kashmir Infiltrations To Be Thwarted *[Delhi Radio]* 36
Leaders Condemn Blasts; Security Tight in Delhi *[Delhi Radio]* 37
Call for Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons *[Delhi Radio]* 37

Iran

Khamene'i Dismisses Mideast Peace Conference *[Tehran Radio]* 37
Khamene'i Addresses IRGC *[Tehran Radio]* 39
IRGC Supports Confrontation of Israel *[Tehran Radio]* 40
President Sees 'Contradiction' in U.S. Policy *[Tehran Radio]* 40
Baker's 'Disappointment' With Syria Viewed *[Tehran Radio]* 41

Pakistan

Foreign Minister Interviewed on Regional Issues *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 16 Oct]* 42
Islamabad Working on Caretaker Afghan Government *[DAWN 16 Oct]* 43
UN Delegates Exchange Remarks on Kashmir *[Islamabad Radio]* 43

Sri Lanka

LTTE Leaders Admit Group 'Disintegrating' *[Colombo International]* 44

Inter-Arab Affairs

Arab League Official—Iraq To Free POW's 'Soon'

NC1810095191 Cairo MENA in Arabic 0915 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] Kuwait, 18 Oct (MENA)—Ambassador 'Abdallah Adam, assistant Arab League secretary general, has stated that the talks he conducted in Baghdad on the release of POW's have achieved a major and unexpected success.

In remarks to the newspaper SAWT AL-KUWAYT published today, Ambassador Adam said his efforts led to the release of 14 Egyptian POW's that Baghdad was detaining. They returned to Cairo several days ago with the help of the International Red Cross.

The assistant Arab League secretary general asserted that Iraq will soon release the POW's it is holding, particularly as his good offices were well received by Iraqi officials.

PLO's Qaddumi To Visit Damascus 18 Oct

NC1710163091 Cairo MENA in English 1345 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Tunis, October 17 (MENA)—Head of the Political Department at the Palestine Liberation Organisation, Faruq Qaddumi, will make a visit tomorrow to Damascus at the invitation of Syrian Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar' for talks with Syrian officials on current developments related to the convening of the Middle East peace conference, a MENA correspondent here learned.

Qaddumi will be accompanied by a delegation comprising three members of the PLO Executive Committee, namely Shafiq al-Hut, Zuhdi al-Nashashibi and Muhammad Milhim.

Syrian Vice President 'Abd-al-Halim Khaddam had made a brief visit to Tunisia last Sunday during which he held talks with president Zine El Abidine Ben Ali on the current developments of the region and proceeded to Algiers on a similar visit without meeting with any of the PLO leaders. This was viewed as an indication of postponing the visit of the Palestinian delegation, but the invitation sent yesterday by the Syrian foreign minister speeded up the visit of the delegation to Damascus in view of the importance of the Syrian-Palestinian coordination at this stage.

Islamic Affairs

ICO Head on Common Market, Soviet Republics

NC1110201691 Istanbul TURKIYE in Turkish 10 Oct 91 p 11

[Interview with Hamid Al-Qabid, secretary general of the Islamic Conference Organization, ICO, by Bener Karakartal and Bilal Kocak, in Istanbul; date not given—all names and titles as published]

[Excerpts] [Question] Esteemed secretary general: The ICO is growing, and we would like see it continue gaining importance in the world. Yet, looking at similar other international organizations, the United Nations and EEC for example, we see that they have enormous financial means and large secretariats. Perhaps they owe part of their productivity to their secretariats. [passage omitted]

[Al-Qadib] The funds of the ICO secretariat are made up of the mandatory contributions of member states. If member states regularly made their contributions, the ICO would maintain a minimum level of productivity. But, unfortunately, the situation is different. Very few members regularly make their contributions. This is why we are unable to implement our programs and decisions. [passage omitted]

[Question] Esteemed secretary general, we just spoke with foreign ministers of the Islamic countries. Most of them would like to see the establishment of an Islamic common market. What is ICO's position on this issue?

[Al-Qadib] If all the decisions made at the Standing Committee for Economic and Trade Cooperation of the Islamic Conference [COMSEC] were implemented, they would constitute a major step towards forming an Islamic common market. However, the current situation is as follows: Many decisions are adopted at COMSEC, but member states do not sign and endorse these decisions. The first thing to do is for the members of ICO to sign COMSEC decisions and implement them. A study has been commissioned to look into the idea of an Islamic common market. [passage omitted]

[Question] Esteemed secretary general, what are the views of ICO on the Islamic Turkish republics in Asia?

[Al-Qadib] I just arrived in Istanbul from New York. Just before leaving New York on 1 October, I met with Turkmenistan Foreign Minister Kuliev Adi, and the Foreign Minister of Kyrgyzstan Mratbek S. Imanaliev at UN headquarters. Before that, the Azerbaijani Foreign Minister Sadikof was received by the ICO. These three republics want to take part in the activities of the ICO. Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan want to join in as observers, and Kyrgyzstan as a guest. I welcome these countries' warm feelings towards the ICO. I hope that these countries and other Muslim countries in Central Asia will join in ICO activities.

Palestinian Affairs

Central Council To Discuss Joint Delegation, Charter

TA1710162591 Jerusalem AL-NAHAR in Arabic 17 Oct 91 pp 1, 11

[Exclusive to AL-NAHAR by Samir Sa'd al-Din]

[Text] Tunis—The Palestine Central Council convened last night with a preliminary discussion of the points that will be taken up today, 17 October. It will also hear an initial report from the PLO delegation which returned from Amman.

The items on the agenda of the Central Council are:
1. Making a decision on whether to take part in the peace conference with a Jordanian delegation and officially designating the Palestinians who will participate in the delegation.
2. Discussing and approving an agreement of principles or a charter between Jordan and Palestine.
3. Reviewing the latest political developments and the contacts made by the PLO with Washington, Moscow, Cairo, Amman, Algiers, and other capitals.

Last night president 'Arafat read the draft of the Jordanian-Palestinian agreement to some Executive Committee members. The paper defines the nature of future Palestinian-Jordanian relations, calling for a confederal link between the two sides whereby each side is to establish its own government and parliament, while a federal government and parliament will also be established.

As to the peace conference, the paper addresses the makeup of the joint delegation, its powers, and authority, which will stem from a higher political committee comprising King Husayn and president 'Arafat. At the suggestion of King Husayn, president 'Arafat will be the official spokesman of that committee.

The paper also notes that the period of autonomy will be one year and will be followed by the process of self-determination within the framework of a confederation. The latest U.S. proposal calls for a three-year period of autonomy.

The paper also stipulates that the issues of economic development, water, ecology, and the like will not be discussed before full agreement on a political settlement is reached, because Syria also supports that concept.

In answer to a question of whether the PLO headquarters will be transferred to Amman during the coming period, 'Arafat said that the Palestinian leadership will remain in Tunis until the return to the homeland.

Approves Conference Participation

JN1810055191 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 0510 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] Following deliberations of the PLO Central Council, the Palestinians announced late last night that the council has officially agreed to the formation of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to the peace conference. The council also announced its approval of the Jordanian-Palestinian agreement for joint political coordination, something which was agreed upon following the Palestinian delegation's talks with Jordanian officials in Amman last Tuesday.

Yasir 'Abd-Rabbuh, PLO Executive Committee members and one of the members of the executive committee's delegation to Jordan, announced yesterday that the question of the formation of the Palestinian delegation will be the responsibility of the PLO Executive Committee, and that the appointment of the delegation members has not yet been decided.

'Abd-Rabbuh reaffirmed the PLO's abidance by the stands that the Palestine National Council had set, particularly with respect to Jewish settlements and the representation of Jerusalem. He said he hopes that Minister Baker and his Soviet counterpart, Boris Pankin, will adopt a common stand on this issue.

When announcing the Palestinian participation in the peace conference, that is scheduled to meet later this month under the auspices of the United States and the Soviet Union, PLO Central Council Spokesman Ahmad 'Abd-al-Rahman said that the council has decided to remain in open session to follow up and assess the steps of the PLO Executive Committee and adopt decisions during all stages.

Delegation List Said Not Finalized

LD1810080791 Tunis Tunisian Republic Radio Network in Arabic 0600 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] A source close to the PLO Central Council meeting, which is held in Tunis, said late last night that the Council has officially agreed on the formation of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation, including political coordination, to the Middle East peace conference. The PLO Central Council has also decided to take part in the peace conference, under the supervision of the United States and the Soviet Union.

The PLO Central Council has entrusted the PLO Executive Committee with the task of forming the Palestinian delegation and to continue its work regarding negotiations on the formula for Palestinian representation.

Ahmad 'Abd-al-Rahman, the spokesman of the PLO Central Council, stated that the Council has decided to embark on a political and firm cooperation between Jordan and the PLO in preparation for the peace conference. The Central Council, which has yet to issue its final statement, has also decided to keep its meeting open so as to follow up and evaluate the efforts of the PLO, and take decisions along all phases. Mr. Ahmad 'Abd-al-Rahman stressed that a list of the seven members of the Palestinian delegation that will take part in the peace conference in the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation, has not been drawn up yet.

On the other hand, the PLO Executive Committee held a meeting as soon as the the proceedings of the Central Council ended, under the chairmanship of Mr. Yasir 'Arafat, and it is awaiting the results of the meeting today in Jerusalem between U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and a Palestinian delegation from the occupied land.

'Arafat To Visit Syria Within 'Hours'

LD1810090291 Rabat Moroccan Kingdom Radio Network in Arabic 0700 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] Concerning Palestinian-Syrian coordination, it has been learned from Tunisia that Mr. Yasir 'Arafat, president of the state of Palestine, will visit Damascus within the coming few hours at the invitation of the Syrian president. The invitation comes after talks last Wednesday in Damascus between the U.S. secretary of state and the Syrian president who then announced that Syria will not participate in the peace conference unless the Palestinians agree to participate in it.

Jordan, Egypt on Itinerary

NC1810112691 Paris AFP in English 1107 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] Tunis, Oct 18 (AFP) - PLO Chairman Yasir 'Arafat will begin a visit this weekend to Syria, Jordan and Egypt to plan Arab strategy ahead of a Middle East conference with Israel, a senior PLO official announced.

'Abd-al Rahim Malluh, a member of the Palestine Liberation Organization Executive Committee, said 'Arafat had been officially invited to all three countries.

The PLO Central Council overnight gave final approval to the formation of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to the conference, scheduled to open in about 10 days under the sponsorship of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Syria, Jordan and Egypt all share borders with Israel and have committed themselves to attending the peace forum.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker was Friday trying to nail down official Israeli backing for the conference.

'Arafat's visit to Syria will be his first since a brief trip in 1988 following the funeral of his slain colleague, Abu-Jihad [Khalil al-Wazir].

The PLO chief was expelled from Damascus on June 24, 1983 after falling out with Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad.

Nusaybah Comments on Talks With Baker

TA1710214491 Jerusalem AL-FAJR in Arabic 17 Oct 91 p 12

[Interview with Dr. Sari Nusaybah, member of Palestinian team talking with Secretary of State James Baker, by Rina Ard'aji; date and place not given]

[Text] [Ard'aji] What is the reason for Sari Nusaybah's inclusion in the recent meeting with Baker in Washington?
[Nusaybah] As far as I am concerned, my participation provides a fresh perspective in support of the Palestinians. It also draws a clearer picture.

[Ard'aji] In one of the al-Hakawati seminars after you got out of prison, you said that only one or two meetings with Baker would be useful, and that their continuation would have negative results. What is your comment?
[Nusaybah] I believe that the series of meetings have clearly not brought about any change in the U.S. position. The position of the Americans has remained the same. Consequently, irrespective of the number of meetings, the question now is whether the Palestinian side will be taking a risk if it decides to enter the peace process.

[Ard'aji] Do you see in those meetings a loss for the Palestinians?
[Nusaybah] The risk is still ahead of us. The question at present is: Will the Palestinians decide that it is preferable to participate or not? In any event, we have to be frank with ourselves and our people. We should clarify the reality of the U.S. position to them so that a mature decision is adopted with regard to what we want to do.

[Ard'aji] So you believe there is no change in the U.S. position, as the Palestinians have always charged?
[Nusaybah] One should not entertain any illusions about a change in the U.S. position. It has not changed at all. America believes in what Reagan said when he called for a specific link between the Palestinian entity and Jordan. That is what America believes in and is endeavoring to achieve, even though it has not made any commitments toward that end.

[Ard'aji] But Faysal al-Husayni, Dr. Hanan 'Ashrawi, and Dr. Zakariya al-Agha have announced that progress has been made in the U.S. position. Do you disagree with them?
[Nusaybah] Yes, I disagree with them. Substantively, the meetings have in fact been no more than a clarification of the U.S. position. Perhaps this delegation believed that a change has occurred, but the essence has not changed at all.

[Ard'aji] Does this mean the U.S. plan is another Camp David?
[Nusaybah] Not only Camp David. It is also close to Shamir's plan of 1989—the same basis and the same framework—a blend of the Reagan plan, Camp David, and Shamir's plan. The question is: Should we deal with this position in the hope of changing it?

[Ard'aji] But could this be a last chance that will not be repeated?
[Nusaybah] There is no last day in life, only the day of judgment.

[Ard'aji] Do you expect an escalation in acts of violence with the approaching convocation of the conference?
[Nusaybah] I believe it is logical to expect a more visible opposition the closer the conference gets. This will include an escalation in acts of violence by both sides, Palestinian and the Israeli.

[Ard'aji] Did you present a list of the delegates who will conduct the negotiations?

[Nusaybah] No, a list of names was not submitted in our recent meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to obtain clarifications, as well as an assurance of the stage reached by America and of its position. We clearly concluded that its position has not changed.

[Ard'aji] Will Palestinian participation be on equal footing with the other parties?

[Nusaybah] If a Jordanian-Palestinian delegation is formed, participation will be on the basis of equality.

[Ard'aji] Will the Palestinian flag be raised at the negotiating table?

[Nusaybah] I believe that this subject is premature. The first and decisive question is: Will there be Palestinian participation in this conference? In other words, will Baker be able to move forward in preparing the conference? There is difficulty, and the question has not been answered yet. The bases of participation are the most important thing. We do not have clear answers.

[Ard'aji] Your remarks give an impression of pessimism.

[Nusaybah] There is no pessimism. In general, and historically, there is a tendency toward reconciliation, but I do not believe that there is an assurance that this conference will be convened or will continue. If it is convened, another step will be added to the previous ones. I repeat that we should not have high expectations. There is a strong possibility that the conference will not be convened, and the reason is a divergence of views about the bases on which it should be convened.

[Ard'aji] Will the number of the members of the Palestinian delegation be equal to that of other delegations?

[Nusaybah] The Central Council will declare its position on the delegation's conditions, but it will not announce the names.

[Ard'aji] Your name has been mentioned in some of the lists. Are you one of the participants?

[Nusaybah] I personally do not believe that there are official lists, but undoubtedly if the Palestinian side actually decides on negotiations, there is a possibility of direct Palestinian participation in the form of technical and consulting teams.

[Ard'aji] Will participation be limited to West Bank and Gaza Strip Palestinians?

[Nusaybah] That is America's position. The Palestinian position, however, continues to stress the participation of Palestinians from all areas without any precondition. As far as I know, this problem has not been solved yet.

[Ard'aji] Recently you distanced yourself from political moves. Why?

[Nusaybah] Whether I moved away or closer has nothing to do with the television screen.

'Arafat Says Fatah Has Bodies of Three Israelis

TA1710221591 Jerusalem AL-FAJR in Arabic 17 Oct 91 p 1

[Text] Beirut—Yasir 'Arafat, president of the state of Palestine, has affirmed that the Fatah Movement is holding the bodies of three Israeli soldiers lost during the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982.

In a recent interview with the Lebanese magazine AL-SHAMS, 'Arafat said that the Palestinians hold a number of corpses, adding: "We do not have any hostages and have exchanged the POW's, but we are still holding some Israeli corpses out of our respect for all the dead."

Algeria

Prime Minister Comments on New Cabinet

LD1710220691 Algiers ENTV Television Network in Arabic 1900 GMT 17 Oct

[Text] The new ministers took up their new duties today under the supervision of Prime Minister Sid Ahmed Ghozali.

[Begin Ghozali recording] My own wish is first to congratulate those who left and thank those who accepted the responsibility.

We must first thank the brothers who left the government. Why? Because when the government was formed in June, they did not ask anything of me. They were aware of the circumstances in which the government was formed. They were not easy circumstances. It was I who proposed to them to join and they accepted without hesitation. This acceptance of the responsibility of joining the government is enough as it shows that they came to the government solely to serve the homeland. The only reason for this change is to try to orientate our work and reinforce the work of the government in the new stage that began after the voting on the electoral laws.

We pray to God to lead us all to success whether within the government or outside of it and to lead us all to what benefits our country and what is good for our country. [end recording]

And just to point out: All these events that followed one another in the national arena during the week—beginning with the approval of the electoral laws in the first multiparty parliament, the recent ministerial reshuffle, the financial crisis in the country, and the international commitments to Algeria—are all subjects that will be raised tomorrow by Amer Medani with Prime Minister Sid Ahmed Ghozali on "The Event" program.

Presidential Decree Issued on Election Dates

LD1710231291 Algiers Radio Algiers Network in French 1900 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] The presidential decree on holding elections has been published in the official gazette. As you know, two dates have been set: 26 December for the first round of the general elections and 16 January 1992 in the event a second round is held.

Declaration of candidatures should be made before 11 November. The election campaign will open on 5 December and end on 23 December. As for the second round, the campaign will start on 4 January and end on 13 January.

Egypt

Foreign Minister Comments on Peace Conference

NC1610161791 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1250 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Excerpts] Cairo, 16 Oct (MENA)—Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa said that President Muhmmad Husni Mubarak will begin a tour of Germany and Austria today during which he will try to enhance Egyptian relations with the two countries. [passage omitted]

Musa said that the possibility of holding a peace conference are better than before and that he hopes the conference is held at the end of October.

Consultations are still underway to overcome existing obstacles on the convocation of the conference and p. ocedural matters, he noted.

The foreign minister discussed the principal issues concerning the conference, saying that they are still being negotiated and discussed, such as the U.S. guarantees or assurances to the parties concerned. He said that these issues and the formation of a joint Palestinian-Jordanian delegation to the conference are the subject of current discussions with Syria, Israel, and the Palestinians.

Al-Qadhdhafi Departs After Talks With Mubarak

NC1210112291 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1036 GMT 12 Oct 91

[Text] Cairo, 12 Oct (MENA)—Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, left Cairo this morning after a three-day visit to Egypt. He was seen off at the airport by President Muhammad Husni Mubarak and his wife. Before his departure, President Mubarak met with Colonel al-Qadhdhafi for 45 minutes at the al-Qubbah presidential palace, where they resumed their dicussion on all current international issues and the Middle East peace conference.

Israel Said Tracking Shipment of Scuds to Syria

NC1610094891 Cairo MENA in Arabic 2238 GMT 15 Oct 91

[Text] Cairo, 15 Oct (MENA)—The newspaper AL-AHRAM has commented on news reports that Israel is tracking a North Korean ship carrying Scud missiles to Syria with the purpose of attacking it. The paper says that such an act of aggression by Israel would be a serious thing to do and one that can only be described as a terrorist act.

In a commentary in its Wednesday issue, the paper adds that such an act would blow up the peace efforts in the region, something that will not be in the interest of any country, particularly Israel. All the parties concerned with this matter must try to avoid any crisis, the paper adds.

The paper emphasizes that Israel must realize that each country in the region is entitled to obtain the weapons it needs to maintain its security so long as Israel is obtaining and stockpiling the most updated weapons, although there is no threat to its security. The paper adds that Israel must deal wisely with the issue of Arab armament. If it wants disarmament of or a freeze on the armament of an Arab country, this will not be possible unless the same applies in parallel to Israel's armament.

The paper concludes by saying that it is unreasonable that Israel possesses "Lance" and "Jericho" missiles of various generations while it finds it too much for an Arab country to obtain missiles that are much less capable than those in Israel's possession.

Israeli Attack Plan Reported

NC1610100191 Cairo MISR AL-FATAH in Arabic 14 Oct 91 pp 1, 8

[Excerpt] On the eve of U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's regional tour, the Israeli Government has decided to create obstacles for the holding of a Middle East peace conference. Israel plans to deal a military strike to Iraq and provoke Syria in the hope of triggering a new war and seizing more Arab land.

Syria has obtained important information concerning an Israeli plan to strike a Korean ship transporting weapons and missiles to Syria as it sails in the Mediterranean toward Syrian ports.

Well-informed diplomatic sources have told MISR AL-FATAH that during the talks President Hafiz al-Asad held in Cairo two days ago, the Syrian leader told President Husni Mubarak that his country has obtained information indicating that the attack will be carried out near Cyprus, and that four F-15 and F-16 planes will take part in it. Al-Asad said that the Israeli Navy has been placed on alert for that purpose.

President al-Asad said that these weapons are essential for Syrian national security, and present no threat to Israel or other countries. Al-Asad added that Israel will be responsible for the renewal of military operations in the region if it carries out such an attack.

Al-Asad and Mubarak discussed the necessary and suitable measures to respond to Israel if it attacks the ship or any military positions inside Syria. Last night, Cairo made urgent contact with the U.S. Administration, asking it to intercede with the Israeli Government and dissuade it from mounting such an operation. [passage omitted]

Israel 'Responsible' for Iran's Nuclear Program

NC1610085191 Cairo AL-AHRAM in Arabic 13 Oct 91 p 7

[Editorial: "Iran's Nuclear Missiles and Mubarak's Initiative"]

[Text] An Israeli magazine recently published a report saying that Iran has succeeded in illegally procuring five tactical nuclear missiles from the Soviet Republic of Kazakhstan by exploiting the state of chaos that reigned in the Soviet Union in the wake of the failed August coup. The Israeli report indicated Iran has asked Israel to pull out of East Jerusalem and allow the Palestinians to establish their state.

Regardless of the report's details, it is true Iran indeed has managed to obtain a nuclear capability. It seems the infiltration by Israeli aircraft of several Arab countries' airspace and their overflights of Iraq represent a prelude to crossing Iraqi airspace to Iran. This could constitute an extremely serious factor in exacerbating tension in the region.

Israel should be held responsible for motivating Iran to obtain nuclear capability through all means because Israel keeps a huge nuclear arsenal and refuses any initiative to eliminate such weapons in return for imposing strict control on the nuclear programs of the region's states. Israel has refused even to submit its nuclear facilities to inspection, which has not prevented any state subjected to inspection from producing nuclear weapons if it so desires.

Everyone, including Iran, must deal with this issue with complete rationalism. We believe that implementing President Husni Mubarak's initiative, which calls for ridding the region of atomic weapons, represents the sole basis that would enable the region to live in peace because it guarantees the elimination of nuclear weapons from the region's states, including Israel and any other state possessing such weapons. President Mubarak's initiative also ensures strict control for halting any endeavors seeking to obtain nuclear weapons.

Reportage on Mubarak Visit to Germany

WA1710132191

For reportage on the visit to Germany by President Husni Mubarak, including reports on his meetings with German President Richard von Weizsaecker and Chancellor Helmut Kohl, please see the Germany section of the 17 October West Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Libya

Al-Qadhdhafi Receives Al-Asad Message 13 Oct

JN1310172491 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1615 GMT 13 Oct 91

[Text] Banghazi—Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the 1 September Revolution in Libya, today received Syrian Vice President 'Abd-al-Halim Khaddam. Mr. Khaddam handed a letter from His Excellency President Hafiz al-Asad dealing with Arab and world developments and the outcome of the meeting held

between the president and President Mubarak of Egypt. Khaddam arrived in Banghazi this morning.

Diplomatic Relations Established With Indonesia

LD1810085491 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 0832 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] New York, 18 Oct (JANA)—The Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah has signed a joint agreement with the Republic of Indonesia to establish diplomatic relations between the two countries at the ambassadorial level. The joint press release stated that Indonesia and the Jamahiriyah, out of their desire to bolster ties of friendship between their two peoples and establish cooperation between both countries in political, economic, and cultural fields; and in accordance with the principles and goals of the UN Charter, have signed an agreement to establish diplomatic relations on the ambassadorial level [words indistinct] as from today.

The agreement was signed on the Libyan side by Dr. 'Ali al-Turayki, the Libyan UN permanent representative, and on the Indonesian side by Nana S. Sutr.sna, the Indonesian UN permanent representative.

Morocco

Importance of Parliament Session Stressed

LD1210073791 Rabat MAP in English 1337 GMT 11 Oct 91

[Text] Rabat, Oct. 11 (MAP)—The Friday press devoted columns to the fall session of the parliament which opens today insisting on its importance and the "decisive juncture" it takes place in. It is seen as decisive in many respects by "AL BAYANE" of the Party for Progress and Socialism because debates will center on the holding of the referendum. Moroccan sovereignty will be defended at the political, legal and diplomatic levels, while MPs should strive to mirror popular aspirations in dealing with government programmes. Both legislative and executive branches should ponder their moves for the sake of national interests and victory for the Moroccan Saharan cause, the daily says. For "AL BAYANE" all action by MPs should be geared towards upholding the cause while helping aspirations for democracy and social justice come true.

The second year of supplementary legislation should aim at total mobilisation to defend territorial integrity and introduce required political reforms for the advent of a state of law, says "AL-ITTIHAD AL-ISHTIRAKI" of the Socialist Union of Popular Forces. It stressed concern over the inception stage of UNO [United Nations Organization] peace-plan saying the parliament should remain in a state of heightened vigilence to foil plots against the Kingdom's territory. The last year of the house should also pave the way for major political reforms through constitutional amendments. The parliament should, indeed, look again into interplay with the government and projects introduced by the opposition and cast aside by the cabinet and its majority in the house. Priorities for the defense of territorial integrity and democracy requirement should go side by side, says the daily calling for genuine representative institutions. For "AL ALAM" of the Istiklal Party, the advent of Modern Morocco is dependent on deep change following the failure of the democratic experiment of the last thirty years. Radical change in the constitution and bills regulating elections and the promotion of a social climate based on respect for human rights and public freedom is the way to modern Morocco, says the Istiklal mouthpiece in Arabic

Syrian Vice President Khaddam Arrives on Visit

LD1410165291 Rabat Moroccan Kingdom Radio Network in Arabic 1600 GMT 14 Oct 91

[Excerpts] Syrian Vice President 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, arrived in Rabat this afternoon. [passage omitted] 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam made the following statement:

[Begin Khaddam recording] The developments under way in the Arab arena regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict warrant consultations and an exchange of opinion among Arab governments. This will result in coordinated stances serving joint Arab interests and goals. Within this framework, President Hafiz al-Asad has entrusted me to convey a message to his brother, King Hassan II, related to these issues, exchanging points of view and coordinating their positions, as I have mentioned, in the service of our joint interests and our joint causes and aims. [end recording]

Delivers Message to King Hassan

JN1510093591 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 0415 GMT 15 Oct 91

[Text] Rabat—His Majesty King Hassan II of Morocco received Syrian Vice President 'Abd-al-Halim Khaddam last night. Khaddam conveyed to his majesty the king a message from Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad dealing with the Middle East situation and the proposed peace conference. On arrival in Rabat last night, the Syrian vice president said that al-Asad's message deals with the current developments in the Arab region and the Arab-Israeli conflict, as well as the exchange of views and coordination of stands in a manner that serves the common pan-Arab interests and objectives.

Jordan's Prince Hasan Speaks at Academy

JN1610073691 Amman JORDAN TIMES in English 16 Oct 91 p 5

[Address by Jordanian Crown Prince Hasan at the second session of the Academy of the Kingdom of Morocco published under the headline: "Does the Right of Intervention Bestow New Legitimacy Upon Imperialism?"—date not given]

[Text] Praise God, Lord of the heavens and earth, master of all inhabitants of the world, glory of Him in heaven and on earth, for He is the Mighty, the Judicious.

I praise Him for what He is and pray to Him that he may bless and grant salvation to His slave and Messenger, Abu-al-Qasim Muhammad, his family and companions.

Your Sharifian Majesty,
Your Royal Highnesses,
Your Excellencies and Graces,
Gracious Brothers,

Nearly eight hundred years ago, a celebrated Andalusian poet, namely al-A'ma al-Tutayli, addressed the people of Sous, as communicated by Yusuf Ibn-Tashafin, with a poem in which he said:

Speak thou to the people of Sous
But be terse and concise
How equitable war is

I saw fit to commence with a citation from this poem because, when scrutinized, the concept of intervention for "humanitarian" reasons, which is the pivotal of our assembly today, is in effect only a modern expression of an old general notion, namely that of a judicious war which al-A'ma al-Tutayli referred to. By virtue of this concept, resort to force—which is a facet of intervention in the domestic affairs of states—is rendered ethnically justifiable, nay imperative. Thus like its predecessor, this modern concept is but an endeavour to find remedy to the problem of justifying violence, since war, as said by the Arabs, is iniquitous because it holds the innocent answerable for the misdeeds of the offender.

If we attempt to find vindication for the concept of "humanitarian" intervention, we are sure to find it in the principle by reason of which warding off a greater evil through the agency of a lesser one is not only rendered possible, but inevitable too.

At the same time, however, we live under a system of international relations characterised by decentralisation and the absence of a body that has the right, or the faculty, to consider motives and actions objectively, and weigh these motives and actions by the same yardstick.

Furthermore, the said system is further characterised by its being one in which words and deeds are remotely distant, if I am permitted to adopt a verse from Tughraci. While talking about the principle of this sovereign equality of states, we, at the same time, find ourselves, in effect, facing great differences among states in military, economic and material power, no less than in scientific progress and cultural accomplishments. Thus, we would not be exaggerating when we say that the title of Charles de Visscher's book "Theorie et Realite en Droit International" may well prove to be an apt one for the history period in which we are now passing, if only by reason of the premise expressed in it concerning the Gulf between theory and application.

Herein arises the question confronting any person undertaking research into the concept of humanitarian intervention: granting states and parties the excuse to intervene in the affairs of other states is a matter not only beset by dangers, but one that can hardly be devoid of miscalculation and arbitrariness in the use of "right," to say nothing of clouding covert motives by justifications that render a particular state at once both judge and adversary. Indeed, any study conducted into cases of intervention on humanitarian bases in modern times will go a long way towards corroborating these suspicions. A few years back, two American researchers published an article in the American journal of International Law reviewing cases of intervention on humanitarian grounds commencing with the 1860 Anglo-French intervention in Lebanon. After surveying the growth of commercial relations between the intervening states and those intervened in, the two writers concluded that intervention on humanitarian grounds was no more than a cover for economic and political motives. It may be noted that the concept of intervention for humanitarian purposes remains latent and is only resorted to when a crisis arises in which justifications for the use of force are non- existent. It was resorted to at the outset of the seventies when India intervened in what was known as East Pakistan. The idea sprang forth anew this year when the allied powers intervened in northern Iraq. I do not attempt to interpret history—it is left to historians to determine whether or not humanitarian consideration really constituted the prime motive behind the said intervention, or whether such considerations were excuses covering other motives. However, it is clear that intervention on humanitarian grounds cannot be effected against the superpowers. For example, a reconsideration of Stalinist policies is currently under way in the Soviet Union, such as transplanting entire nations from their original homes to exile—causes which, by currently applicable standards, necessitate intervention. Yet it is no exaggeration to say that even the mere notion of intervention was not discussed.

We may thus conclude by saying that this so called humanitarian intervention is but a concept continually used against the weak in a selective manner and is ever beset by perils. I have already made reference here to the principle of warding off a greater evil through the agency of a lesser one. However, in the wake of this review, I deem it imperative to refer to yet another concept no less authoritative and competent than the first, namely that avenues leading to inequity must be closed.

The authors of the United Nations Charter were absolutely right when they dismissed the notion of humanitarian intervention from the exceptions warranting resort to force, for "the general precept of Article II—4—of the U.N. Charter is clear in the ban it places on the resort to force. The exceptions which the Charter incorporates, namely the right of self-defence and the coercive measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, are the only exceptions to this general precept.

In considering the U.N. Charter to be a significant indicator along the path leading to an international achievement of the rule of law, and not merely an end to this path, we have to admit that it would be incumbent on us to handle cases wherein resort to violence is based on an ethical justification—cases for which there are no provisions in the Charter, as I have already pointed out. These notions have manifested themselves since the time the U.N. Charter was adopted in San Francisco in 1948. They manifested themselves in two avenues: the first propounds that the struggle of peoples, whose homelands are colonised and occupied, and the support that such peoples may find, are legally justified on account of such struggle being ethically justified, regardless of the clarity of the exceptions provided for in the Charter: the second maintains that intervention on humanitarian grounds is no less legally justified on account of its being ethically justified in spite of the Charter's exceptions. Thus, we face two avenues equally bearing the same malady, namely that a noble end justifies the means—avenues which, as I have already stated, constitute an expression to a more comprehensive concept, i.e. the concept of a just war. It may be noted here that the states which adhered to the literal provisions of the Charter, in matters pertaining to the struggle of peoples, are normaly those that do not adhere very faithfully to the actual provisions in matters pertaining to humanitarian intervention. This proves, beyond any shadow of doubt the truth of what a celebrated African legist, from Senegal, namely Minister Doudo Thiam, said in his third report submitted to the International Law Committee, in 1983: "Criminal law is steeped in subjectivity."

Consequently, we face a difficult choice: do we adhere to the literal provisions of the U.N. Charter, with all the guarantees that such adherence bestows on small nations, and with all the clarity the legal contents import; or do we endeavour to inject into the Charter principles based on ethical foundations and justifications?

It appears to me that the smaller the world the faster the acquisition of information. Therefore, the pressure for finding justifications for humanitarian intervention will mount, thereby necessitating the placement of the issue of humanitarian intervention in its proper framework. This is done not only through giving the issue an all-found discussion, but also through discussing the notions that, together with it, contribute to the malady, thereby facilitating the arrival at guarantees that prevent the concept of human intervention from becoming a cover to political considerations. It becomes apparent here that entrusting an international legal body with the task of determining cases that warrant resort to humanitarian intervention is inevitable. Such a body must, perforce, be able to obtain information prior to the actual intervention taking place, and be in a position to monitor such intervention during its course by way of circumventing any deviation that may occur. Humanitarian intervention is confused at times with the concept of legitimate self-defence. In the well known Entebbe operation, there were attempts to justify the intervention of Israel on the basis of legitimate self-defence and humanitarian intervention at one and the same time. It is imperative not only to detach the two concepts at the time of implementation, but to pay due deference to relativity between imminent danger and the degree of intervention.

These are the ideas I wished to present to you pertaining to the issue of humanitarian intervention—an issue which will be quite controversial in the years to come, and one which is expected to play a significant role in the structure of the New World Order. I feel at this juncture that I must call to memory the fact that it is in the Islamic world that many of the cases of humanitarian intervention have taken place since the outset of the 19th century. It is only self-evident, therefore, that the concept of humanitarian intervention be looked at with suspicion. Be that as it may, we must not overlook the fact that the concept of equity, and the sacredness of human life, have always been deeply inherent in our tradition. And although we do not share the view that noble ends justify means, we are, nevertheless, of the opinion that the solution lies not in forsaking noble ends but rather in bettering the means for achieving them.

Peace be with you, and may god grant you his blessing and mercy.

Reportage on Filali Visit to Mexico

WA1710183291

For reportage on the visit to Mexico by Abdellatif Filali, minister of state for foreign affairs and cooperation, including talks with Mexican Foreign Relations Secratary Fernando Solana and President Carlos Salinas de Gortari, and the signing of a cooperation agreement, please see the Mexico section of the 17 October Latin America DAILY REPORT.

Talabani Alleges 'Large-Scale' Attacks on Kurds

PM1510090791 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 10 Oct 91 p 5

[Interview with Jalal Talabani, leader of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, by Dr. Najm 'Abd-al-Karim in London; date not given]

[Excerpts] [Talabani] Before we begin the interview, I want to tell AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT readers about what is happening in Kurdistan. Since Saturday 5 October, the Iraqi forces have been launching large-scale attacks on the peaceful Kurdish population, using three Iraqi divisions, including the 3d Armored Division, over 150,000 soldiers in the area of Karkuk, 700 tanks, and scores of other heavy weapons and heavy artillery, renewing the scorched-earth policy and methods used by the Iraqi Government against the Kurdish people in the previous years of war.

The attack began Saturday with the shelling of the towns of Kifri and Klar, which killed scores of people and injured many others. On Sunday the Iraqi forces launched a massive attack on the area. They met fierce resistance, and heavy losses were inflicted on the 3d armored division. Scores of Iraqi soldiers and many tanks were captured. On Monday the Iraqi forces attacked the area of Saydan, but the attack was repulsed and large numbers of Iraqi soldiers were taken prisoner. On Monday the Iraqi forces also began shelling al-Sulaymaniyah. As a result, hundreds of peaceful civilians were martyred. Statements made by captured prisoners, especially officers, revealed that the orders for the attacks on the Kurds were issued by Iraqi Defense Minister Husayn Kamil, who is also the Iraqi president's brother-in-law.

The strange thing about these operations is that they were carried out in full view of the UN forces stationed there. When these UN forces tried to inquire about these incidents, the Iraqi Government's reply was that the Iraqi Army was carrying out military exercises. When asked how you could shell the population with heavy artillery while representatives of the United Nations are there to protect them, the Iraqi reply was that there were some mistakes during the exercises, as a result of which some fire was aimed at the town.

The truth is that by taking that action, the Iraqi Government hoped to achieve the following two objectives:

1. To render hundreds of thousands of Kurds homeless yet again, and use that to put pressure on the Kurdish negotiators to accept the Iraqi Government's proposals.

2. To test the UN forces' reaction and find out whether they would retaliate or not.

Finally, I want to say that a massacre is taking place in northern Iraq while the free world is unaware of what the Iraqi Government is doing, because that government has erected an iron curtain to conceal its actions in Iraq. I hold the free world responsible. It should side with the Iraqi people as they face the fiercest and ugliest dictatorship known to mankind.

['Abd-al-Karim] You were the architect of the joint action committee and the official spokesman of the Beirut conference. You had declared that you would not shake hands with the Iraqi regime for any reason, but what actually happened was that, some weeks after the Beirut conference, you left Damascus for Zakho to tell the masses gathered there that they should march on Baghdad to bring down the Iraqi regime. Suddenly we saw you in Baghdad shaking hands with Saddam and kissing him. That surprised the Iraqi opposition and others.

[Talabani] First of all, let me tell you that you have exaggerated my role in the Iraqi opposition. I am one of the contributors to that opposition, and I am honored to play my part as a member of the Iraqi opposition, but not as the architect, spokesman, or anything like that. Yes, I had stressed that the regime should be brought down and democracy established to replace the dictatorship. We worked hard for that end, and we cooperated with many forces in order to bring that regime down, but we did not succeed.

The Iraqi regime also used all criminal means of oppression, including internationally banned chemical weapons, to bring us down, but it did not succeed in doing that. [passage omitted]

The Kurdish leadership decided to accept the Iraqi Government's offer of negotiations to save the millions who were living under most severe conditions where bitterly cold weather was killing the elderly and the children, a massacre abetted by the Iraqi Government with the aim of subduing the Kurdish people.

Furthermore, we accepted the Iraqi offer to find out to what extent we could fulfill the Kurdish people's ambitions through negotiations with Baghdad. [passage omitted]

No agreement was reached with the Iraqi regime, for many reasons. The regime insisted on not taking any steps to establish true democracy in Iraq. It also rejected the Kurdish autonomy demands. In fact, it sought to make the Kurds a part of that regime and its current structure, so that we would support it against the Iraqi opposition. It also wanted us to antagonize the whole world that is hostile to it.

Furthermore, the regime wanted us to declare open hostility toward such neighbors as Turkey, Iran, Syria, and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. It did not refer to Kuwait, but spoke of the rulers of Kuwait, as if it did not wish to recognize Kuwait as an independent state. That is why the negotiations stumbled and failed abominably. We as Kurds had thought that the calamities which befell Iraq would lead to a reassessment based on the question of profit or loss for Iraq. [passage omitted]

['Abd-al-Karim] In answering my question, you have actually avoided giving a direct answer by relating events and circumstances that would make the listener agree with your conclusion on cooperation with the regime, but there are resolutions issued by all the Iraqi opposition forces, and you have contributed to most of them. They all emphasize noncooperation with Saddam Husayn's regime. What is your comment?

[Talabani] There is a confusion of concepts here. There is a difference between cooperation and negotiation. The Palestinian revolution is now trying to negotiate with Israel. Does that mean that the Palestinians want to cooperate with Israel? Negotiation does not necessarily mean cooperation. [passage omitted]

Dialogue is an acceptable principle provided it leads to a sound result. If the Kurdish movement's dialogue with the Iraqi Government were to result in that movement becoming a part of that dictatorial regime, that would be unforgivable high treason and the movement would be betraying its principles, friends, and partners in the struggle.

In the final analysis, negotiations aimed at freedom, democracy, and fulfillment of everyone's rights are, in my view, a civilized and desirable phenomenon. [passage omitted]

['Abd-al-Karim] You led the negotiations with the Iraqi regime in the first round which, it has been claimed, was arranged with the help of French President Mitterrand's wife and the French minister of state for humanitarian action, but the second round was chaired by your colleague Mas'ud Barzani. Now we find you opposed to the negotiations which are continuing with Barzani. Does that mean that you disagree with Mas'ud Barzani regarding the negotiations?

[Talabani] I regret to say that there is a lot of confusion here. There is no connection between Mrs. Mitterrand's visit to Kurdistan and our negotiations with the Iraqi regime. When she arrived in the area I was already negotiating with the Iraqi president in Baghdad. As regards the French humanitarian action minister's visit, that too had nothing to do with the negotiations. [passage omitted]

There are many other rumors which I totally refute and deny. These rumors are that the Western states paved the way for the negotiations between the Iraqi Government and the Kurds. That is a lie and a fabrication. The decision to negotiate was a Kurdish decision made by the Kurdish parties after learning of the Iraqi Government's interest in that. As regards my appointment as head of the delegation to the negotiations with the Iraqi Government, that was also a Kurdish decision. As for your assertion that the second round was held with brother Mas'ud Barzani, I want you to know the truth, which is that his arrival in Baghdad for the second round of negotiations was also a collective Kurdish decision. Brother Mas'ud did not take a unilateral stand; nor did I. He carried the same paper as I did regarding, as I said, democracy for all the Iraqi people, autonomy, and Kurdish rights. We all proceed on the same basis, although we may have different styles. There are discussions now on the differences. Actually, we in the Kurdistan Front represent eight parties, each with its own method of decisionmaking and approach to implementation. They include socialists, communists, nationalists, Islamists, democrats, and so on. So you should not expect there to be no differences in the endeavors of these parties. Even inside the same political committee and the same party there may be conflicting views, but that is a healthy sign, especially when it comes to important issues.

So the existence of such differences with brother Mas'ud does not mean differences over principles. We are in agreement with brother Mas'ud on the main issues, but we disagree with him in our approach toward assessing the current regime in Iraq. It is a difference of form, not substance.

The Kurdish leadership is agreed on the need to achieve a minimum of the Kurdish demands, including democracy, autonomy, and other rights. The Kurdish leadership is collectively in agreement on the need to continue the dialogue until we get a result, be it negative or positive. We in the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan believe that there is no point in having a dialogue with that dictatorship, because it does not want to give up its arrogance to establish democracy and give the Iraqi people their legitimate right to build their modern civilization, having itself destroyed that civilization.

['Abd-al-Karim] Is that why you withdrew from the negotiations?

[Talabani] We have not withdrawn yet. The negotiations are still in progress, but by correspondence, not face to face.

['Abd-al-Karim] Are you trying to say that all the Kurdish people agree to these negotiations or that they approve?

[Talabani] I believe that the vast majority of the Kurdish people accept the negotiations. It was that approval which drove the Kurdish leaders to negotiation; otherwise we would not have done it, regardless of the changes and different positions dictated by the different endeavors and positions of each faction of the Kurdish people, all primarily in the interest of the people. At present, however, the vast majority of Kurds are opposed to the terms which the Iraqi Government presented to the Kurdish side and which it wants to impose. [passage omitted]

['Abd-al-Karim] You now have good relations with Turkey. Does that not affect relations between the Kurds of Iraq and the Kurds of Turkey, especially the Kurdish Labor Party opposed to the Turkish regime?

[Talabani] Let me first tell you that after the war, Kurdistan was divided into parts attached to the various states of the region, such as Iran, Iraq, Syria, the Soviet

Union, and Turkey. The lives of the Kurds in each of these states are linked to the people of that state and their circumstances.

There are Kurdish parties in all these places, all doing their best in their own way to promote unity of the Kurdish people.

For example, the Kurds of Iran are opposed to the central government of Iran and cooperate with the Baghdad regime, while the Kurds of Iraq are opposed to the central government of Baghdad and cooperate with Iran. These situations do not create conflicts between the Kurds of Iraq and the Kurds of Iran. The same thing applies to Turkey. Our relations with Turkish President Ozal are very good and we are constantly trying to improve and develop these relations because we believe that to be necessary, good, and beneficial. If there are some Kurdish parties in Turkey that oppose the Turkish regime, that is their affair and their decision and it is they who choose their own method of struggle without our interference as Kurds.

['Abd-al-Karim] Will you be returning to Damascus?

[Talabani] Damascus is the city which always embraced us and helped us at the most difficult times. To us, Damascus is the second capital, in fact it is the twin capital. It is dear to my heart and I will return to it whenever necessary. [passage omitted]

['Abd-al-Karim] Some people say that the joint action committee has failed to keep pace with the events which Iraq has experienced over the past months. Actually some people believe that the Beirut conference failed to realize the desired aim and was in fact disappointing.

[Talabani] What is the alternative? Where are the forces which can impose themselves as an alternative to the joint action committee? How powerful are they? What are their connections inside and abroad? What is their ability to work?

If there are shortcomings and omissions in the joint action committee, we should work to correct them and make it more effective instead of looking for alternatives which do not exist in the first place.

The action committee needs strengthening and guidance, not abolition. This is because there is no one who can abolish it as a reality. And if there is an alternative to the joint action committee espousing principles that realize for us what we want, then tell me of it and I am ready to join hands with it and leave the joint action committee. [passage omitted]

['Abd-al-Karim] There is disharmony among the opposition groups because of ideological differences and intellectual and political principles. Has the existence of this tangle of contradictions in the principles of the groups belonging to the same organization, under the joint action committee, prevented the achievement of any successes on the Iraqi opposition scene?

[Talabani] No. I believe that this is the nature of life. What can we do if society is divided in such a manner? This is the Iraqi intellectual fabric.

Do you want me to abolish that society? That is the way Iraqis are: There are communists, Ba'thists, liberals, democrats, Islamists, socialists, independents, and so on.

Are we supposed to replace reality with our own wishes? Instead of making us fight and level accusations at one another, the bitter reality which the Iraqi people and indeed the region are experiencing prompts us to unite and cooperate.

['Abd-al-Karim] You attacked the Iraqi regime at the Labor Party conference, while Mas'ud Barzani is calling for continuing negotiation with Saddam Husayn. What should I call that? Is this an allocation of roles, or do you want to embarrass Mas'ud Barzani?

[Talabani] I said at the conference that dictatorship is the principal obstacle to national unity. In that speech at the conference, a copy of which I gave you, I did not mention the Iraqi president's name. I concentrated on the nature of the dictatorship, because I now differ with those who concentrate on attacking the person of the president of the Iraqi republic. I do not believe that Saddam alone is the obstacle to democracy in Iraq. There is a whole regime which must be removed completely. Saddam is just one person.

['Abd-al-Karim] Saddam called for party pluralism. Is he expected to turn suddenly from a dictator into a democratic ruler?

[Talabani] I believe that there should be a democratic system in Iraq and that free elections should be held. If Iraqi President Saddam Husayn nominates himself and wins the elections, it will mean that he enjoys the Iraqi people's confidence. That is provided that the elections are free and impartial elections under a democratic system.

If he does not win, then he has to submit to the Iraqi people's will and depart. Is he not content with all these years? Is he not content with all that destruction? Is he not content with the rivers of blood?

I believe that the present regime is a dictatorial regime which does not enjoy the Iraqi people's approval, otherwise it would not have turned to dictatorship and bloodshed. [passage omitted]

['Abd-al-Karim] What did you bring back from the United States?

[Talabani] We went to the United States as an Iraqi Kurdistan Front at the invitation of the U.S. secretary of state. We were received at the Defense Department, at the U.S. Congress, and in many political circles, and also, of course, at the U.S. State Department. Heated dialogues were held between us over many regional

issues, especially with the strategic institutions concerned with the region's affairs. And we realized many of the aims for which we went there.

We returned with specific promises from the Americans. I sum them up as follows: supporting the Iraqi people in order to replace the dictatorial regime with a democratic regime. This is the first time a statement like this has been issued officially and openly by the United States, as in the past there were fears about addressing the subject of democracy, party pluralism, and a direct electoral system to create a correct democratic atmosphere.

The Americans emphasized to us that they would stand by us as Kurdish people if we were exposed to aggression from the central government in Baghdad. That promise has a great impact on the Kurdish people's struggle march, because it will eliminate the thought of fear and alarm which has often affected us under the various Iraqi regimes. The United States also emphasized to us that it would defend southern Iraq if it was exposed to aggression by Baghdad. They also emphasized to us their willingness to provide constant humanitarian aid until the predicament experienced by the Iraqi people in general and the Kurdish people in particular disappears. The U.S. State Department emphasized to us that its relations with the Iraqi opposition—especially with the Kurdistan Front, on the grounds that this front is the legitimate representative of the Kurdish people in Iraq—will strengthen and improve in order to work to remove the dictatorship. [passage omitted]

['Abd-al-Karim] Did the negotiations between you and the regime cover the rebuilding of Iraq?

[Talabani] In the negotiations we focused on the rebuilding of Kurdistan.

I believe that the present Iraqi regime is not capable of rebuilding Iraq. Unless the regime as a whole is changed, Iraq will remain shattered and destroyed and it will not be possible to salvage it.

['Abd-al-Karim] In your negotiations with the regime you must have broached its occupation of the State of Kuwait. Can you shed any light on this point?

[Talabani] Saddam does not recognize Kuwait. He even presented to us a special clause within the conditions for accepting the negotiations stating that the Kurdish side should support the Baghdad government in its hostility against its neighbors. With regard to Kuwait, he made reference to the rulers of Kuwait, as the Iraqis do not want to recognize it as a sovereign state that occupies its own position within the international community. This is their position.

They still believe that Kuwait is part of Iraq but circumstances forced them to say something else. And for our part, we rejected the entire agreement with them and did not even partially accept it.

['Abd-al-Karim] During the negotiations with Saddam and others, what were the cards presented to you regarding dealing with the various sectors of the Iraqi people?

[Talabani] We were aware of all their games and methods, since they play a two-way sectarian and national game: When they want to hit the Kurds they play the national card. When they want to hit the south they use the sectarian card; but we thwarted these immoral methods. [passage omitted]

['Abd-al-Karim] How do you visualize a future action plan for the Iraqi opposition?

[Talabani] I simply say that a government-in-exile and a national council-in-exile will not be able to achieve any positive result. Thus the Iraqi opposition has no option but to move its activities to the north to establish its government inside Iraqi territory. That is the only solution. Anyone who thinks otherwise is refusing to face the reality: a transitional government inside the homeland's territory, not outside it. As for dialogues and discussions abroad, they are a waste of time.

['Abd-al-Karim] And how long will Saddam Husayn remain in power?

[Talabani] I believe that there is no future for dictatorship, and the signs before us are many.

Writer Sees 'National Duty' To Support Saddam

JN1510092291 Baghdad AL-JUMHURIYAH in Arabic 12 Oct 91 p 3

[Article by Iyad Sa'id Thabit: "They Destroyed Us, May God Ruin Them"]

[Text] He who believes that one of our objectives is to bring about internal splits within the ranks of the so-called Iraqi opposition parties and movements is entirely mistaken. It is impossible for us to entertain such a notion, because we do not have any vested partisan interest in such an eventuality. We do not belong to a political party. Furthermore, we are not planning to form any political party. We have no faith in partisan allegiance. We do not have this narrow-minded perspective which marks zealots when they attempt to relate to the events and changes taking place around them. One more thing, we do not have any ambitions or vested interests regarding the seizure of power. These ambitions and interests prompt numerous parties to do their best to double their size by enlisting the largest possible number of members, using all means, even if some of these means "run counter" to the most basic code of ethics, such as seeking political asylum. To achieve this objective, some party leaders are willing to go to a European country to obtain documents which distinguish them from animals, despite the fact that dogs in Europe might have far better documents showing that they are more important than human beings. Each and every one of us knows some of these persons who sold out to this or that

party in return for obtaining these documents which give them freedom of movement and some sense of security.

Because we respect man, our objective while dealing with him is entirely different. Our primary ambition is to contribute, along with all noble sons of our nation, toward freeing man from the restrictions which shackle and dehumanize him and undermine his dignity. We are specificaly speaking here about the sick phenomena which have shining, yet deceptive appearances, and for a long time were used to delude people. People were deluded into believing that espousal of these phenomena and adherence to them would help them realize their hopes and aspirations. A most important step is taken when an attempt is made to see what lies behind these shining and bright facades which are used to prevent man from seeing the features and landmarks of the road. If one does this, he would see the facts with his own eyes, and not as they are distorted and misrepresented by political gimmicks and greed. If one takes this step, he should not heed the fact that this might worry and bother many people, and cause their indignation.

For many long decades, we have been experiencing an exacerbating status of alienation and fragmentation. Most Arab governments and their political organizations conspired to create such a status and to plague us with it. For a very, very long time, we have only heard the political views that serve the ambitions of this party and seek to undermine those of the hostile party and tarnish its image, or vice versa. Even if conflicting parties were to present some facts through their media, or through the leaflets and statements issued by the political parties sitting in their laps, the Arab masses hardly take these facts seriously. This is because these facts are presented through a political perspective that only serves the ambitions of the party presenting them. Usually, these facts are presented amid a surging sea of slander, lies, and exaggerations that rob these parties of what could have remained of their credibility. As for these political parties and movements which sought refuge in Arab countries after they were harassed in their own country because of the pursuit of the authorities (those who fled and sought asylum abroad might constitute part of the party or the whole party), they soon discover that their moves are entirely shackled by the objectives of the host country's authorities, which rarely fall in line with those of these movements. These authorities make very little effort to have their objectives fall in line with those of the opposition movements. In no time, these movements discover that what is actually required of them is to make political moves that are in line with the political interests of the ruling regime to serve it in its duel with the other regime from which they fled. These interests have nothing to do with the masses' interests, which are spelled out in the literature of these parties and movements. If a party were to discover this fact, and decide that it would outsmart the state organs and continue its struggle to achieve its objectives, it would soon find itself discarded and all doors and windows before it closed. Eventually, it would find itself paralyzed and incapable of moving beyond the cafes and bars spread everywhere.

The experiences of those who operated in the Syrian arena are still vivid in the minds of all patriotic and honorable Iraqis whose bad luck made them work there for a short or long period. As for the other parties and movements that became convinced of the futility of swimming against the current, they made an about-face, thanks to the financial temptations employed, and began to swim comfortably in its direction (we are not here exclusively referring to the Syrian arena). In no time, these parties' principles, which were couched in high-falutin words contained in their platforms, turned into mere nonsense used for decorative purposes and classified ads, whose writers were paid in advance. The prime objective of such ads was to attract the largest possible number of those standing in line and seeking, in the countries of refuge and alienation, help to secure their means of livelihood and some of their most basic needs through the state agencies, which are closed to all except those with a favored position in these countries. If differences between the two countries exacerbated and the battles between the them become pitched, these parties and movements were allowed to turn into pointed arrows used by this party against the other party in accordance with carefully studied plans and within the limits allowed. When such a thing happened, these arrows were unleashed and allowed to raise their voices loudly, uttering slander, lies, facts, and every other conceivable thing. Then, people heard the slander and vituperations, the like of which were not even used by Jarir [an Umayyad poet notorious for his excessive use of vituperations and slander in his poetry] against al-Farazdaq [another Umayyad poet].

When peace was restored between the two countries—and there can be numerous reasons for restoring peace—and when reconciliation and conciliation were achieved, the situation was reversed at a legendary pace that left one befuddled and unable to believe the praise and glorification aired by the same media, as though the media that had been broadcasting slander and vituperations were the media of another country.

In the middle of these conflicting, inharmonious, and unjustifiable moves—since most often they were not prompted by drastic political changes in the countries involved—facts vanished and the masses sank in a sea of perplexity that rendered everything incomprehensible to them. They have destroyed us, may God ruin them. This is what happened at the hands of our Arab governments and the parties and movements sitting in their laps. These things which have been happening and will continue to happen in the future are behind the status of division, fragmentation, and alienation being experienced by the Arab masses everywhere in this age.

This reality reflects only a fraction of the true Arab state of affairs, as well as the state of affairs of many Arab parties which grew and prospered in the laps of Arab regimes. Likewise, this reflects only a fraction of the state of affairs of the parties, movements, and symbols making up the so-called Iraqi opposition. The picture, with its its current dimensions, however, has caused

them to reach the rock bottom of agentry and treason, particularly in the wake of the brute aggression against Iraq, as is well known. While noting these facts, we do not seek to bring about internal splits within these parties and movements. We do not have any partisan ambitions aiming to win over to our side any member of these parties or movements. Our objective and duty is to make these bare facts, of which we are well aware, known to members of these parties and movements, who make up the bases of these parties and movements. Our objective and duty is to put before them their responsibilities so that they can choose their paths. Once they know all facts, we believe that they will have only three options. The first option is to overlook facts, shy away from them, and continue to stick to the treasonous political line imposed on them by their leaders, who are linked financially and politically to the American, Israeli, or other intelligence organs. If they were to take this option, this would mean that these party members have chosen to fully identify with these leaders. Consequently, they would have to bear the consequences before the people when the time of reckoning comes. The second option is that of rejecting these leaders' lines and splitting. As for the last option, it is that of effecting an internal cohesion aimed at creating a strong internal current to topple the agent leaders and sweep them out along with all elements that sold out to the devil. Consequently, these party members would attempt to reform the party or movement, using the nationalistic current which would be resolutely and relentlessly espoused by all nationalists.

One of the facts that we want to make clear to all sides is that there is a national regime in Iraq that is hostile to imperialism under a strong, patriotic leader who succeeded in leading his country in the fiercest and most violent battle in the modern age, and who, along with his people and army, showed legendary steadfastness against an aggression carried out by 33 states that coalesced and devoted all their sophisticated capabilities to destroying him and the army and all that it possesses by sophisticated technological means. We know that stating such a fact and the attempt to entrench it in the conscience of the masses will make many politicians and even nonpoliticians very angry. Some of these have their known and understandable reasons. They cling to their claims that the Iraqi regime and Saddam are subservient to America in the same way a desperate drowned person clings to a straw in the hope of acquitting themselves from treason and agentry of which the people accuse them. They hope that when they claim that they tried to topple Saddam Husayn only because he is an "American agent," they will succeed in deceiving and misleading the people and in distracting attention from them.

These claims are ridiculous and naive. If you claim that you and Iraq were in the same trench, then why did you respond to the orders of America, "Israel," Saudi Arabia, and others very enthusiastically and come from all directions to meet each other and to embrace the same state which requested that the colonialist armies enter our territory and launch that treacherous and brutal aggression, and which financed these armies and you too? Why did you continue your meetings in the second "Arab" state of aggression to draw plans in the hope of achieving the objective which the aggression failed to achieve, and to get paid just as all those who participated in the aggression? Did you not do all this? Have we been unjust to you? So, why all this crazy panting about offering services to America and "Israel" to topple the regime and to open Iraq for them? Moreover, why is America doing its utmost and perpetrating the most brutal crimes in history to destroy him if he is really its man?

Please, do not play this naive old tune again if you want anyone to listen to you. You must find a pretext that is less naive and superficial. You say that he refused the Americans' order to abandon his position of power and this is why they attacked him, and when they failed to achieve this, they asked you to do so. This is relatively better; however, this gives stronger proof that you are agents, and does not explain to us why America wanted to destroy him if he really was its man in the region. It had better treat him in the same way it treated Yeltsin in Russia instead of leading the world's evildoers in this fierce campaign. Try once again because you may succeed this time; however, this is not our topic now. What we wanted to say is that those people have their own reasons to become very angry over conveying facts to the people, and that we understand these reasons, as we said.

The thing that cannot be understood at all is the simmering annoyance among many educated and patriotic Iraqis when these facts are mentioned in their presence. What should take place is exactly the opposite. They are supposed to feel overjoyed since they know that Iraq, the country with political, geographic, and economic importance, has a nationalist regime bearing deep within it numerous possibilities for destroying the schemes of the enemies that are ready to engulf us. Could it be possible that the reason is only that you do not like Saddam, and do not like his absolute single-handedness in administering the rule? The presence of a nationalist regime which has military, economic, geographic, and political weight in Iraq, however, is a great thing and highly important. It is much greater than the emotions of love and hatred, an issue which could form the basis for proceeding toward liberation and emancipation on the level of the whole Arab world and which could very probably be the starting point for liberating Palestine.

Forfeiting this national base, regardless of all the comments, criticisms, and feelings of love and hatred, is unforgivable. The national duty commits all citizens, especially the educated, to make every effort and dedicate all potential to support this rare national stage and prevent it from deterioration. The United States, Israel, and all the other forces of evil will not rest until this base is finally and completely annihilated and the rule is changed into one in harmony with the requirements and conditions of the new world order under the leadership of the United States. Am I saying something wrong?

In simpler and clearer words, the minimum position required to be enunciated by any patriot who is loyal to his people and nation should be summed up in the following: Yes, the Iraqi regime is a nationalist regime, hostile to colonialism and Zionism. We all will work together against all colonialist attempts to topple it; however, we demand that the regime realize certain objectives.

But for us to burst onto the path of conspiracy has only one meaning. It means that we have placed ourselves under the control of enemies and their agents in their region, and also at their disposal, because we, of our own volition, accepted standing in their trenches. The minimum patriotic position demanded does not mean at all that the individual should turn into a propaganda trumpet. These two options are the only options that we have.

Is it reasonable for rancor to be the only driving force pushing a patriotic intellectual to sink into the quagmire of agents? This could be right; however, I do not believe this to be true.

Rebels Report Reduced Ba'th Party Influence

NC1710190191 (Clandestine) Voice of Rebellious Iraq in Arabic 1430 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] The fear of the just punishment that our fighters are meting out to the henchmen of the Saddamist party has greatly reduced party meetings. According to our sources, the role of the 'Aflaqites [reference to Michel 'Aflaq, founder of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party] has drastically dwindled the southern areas. The sources also report that the role of the Saddamist party in the north has almost completely disappeared, even in such large governorates such as al-Sulaymaniyah, Irbil, and Dahuk.

Due to our forceful uprising in the face of the 'Aflaqites, reckless Saddam is relying more than ever on his henchmen in the security organs, particularly on personnel who have been recently transferred from the Army.

Many members of the heinous party are not doing any more work for the party, having became more aware of the criminal role of Saddam and his henchmen and the barbaric methods that the 'Aflaqites are using against our people.

Reports on Talks With U.S. Secretary of State

'Significant Progress' Seen

TA1710190691 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1817 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Statement by Ehud Gol, Prime Minister Shamir's media adviser, at a news conference following Shamir's second meeting with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker at the Prime Minister's Office in Jerusalem—live; broadcast monitored in progress]

[Excerpts] ...The meeting opened with the participation of Foreign Minister David Levi and Defense Minister Moshe Arens, in addition to the prime minister and the secretary of state. Afterward, teams of experts continued the meeting for approximately 90 minutes, and it went over all the issues. After the discussion of the issues by the experts, the entire team [previous word in English] headed by the prime minister and the secretary of state, returned to continue the meeting. I can now report that good progress was achieved in the talks, and an additional meeting was scheduled for tomorrow morning at 1130, to finalize all the issues not resolved today. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified correspondent] [question indistinct]

[Gol, in English] Actually the talks between the experts will continue tonight and tomorrow morning. Tomorrow morning at 1130 the prime minister with the secretary and with the teams will have another session in which they will finalize all the issues.

[IDF political correspondent Natan Gutman] Did the talks also deal with the Palestinian issue?

[Gol] The talks dealt with many issues. Significant progress was reached on many issues; however, we shall not issue any details about the subjects that were discussed tonight. We will leave that for the conclusion of the talks tomorrow, which will be followed by a statement by the prime minister and the secretary of state.

[Gutman] Do we expect the list of Palestinian representatives to be brought to the talks tomorrow?

[Gol] At this stage we shall not discuss that issue. We will leave everything for tomorrow. I suggest you remain patient until tomorrow. I think that the characterization of good talks is acceptable to both the prime minister and the secretary of state. We shall continue the talks in the same atmosphere tomorrow in order to conclude things in a most positive manner. [passage omitted]

Shamir: Some Questions 'Remain Open'

TA1810113391 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1106 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Statement and question-and-answer session in English by Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir after his meeting with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker at the Prime Minister's Office in Jerusalem—live; broadcast in progress]

[Excerpts] [Shamir] ...very meaningful, friendly, and long discussions with the secretary of state and his assistants about all issues related to the peace process between Israel and all the Arab countries, the Arab countries in the region.

The discussions have been friendly, and we have made much progress on most of the problems that we discussed. There are some questions that remain open. I will bring our conclusions, the conclusions of the discussions, before our government on one of its next sessions, and the government will take a decision about the further steps of Israel in this regard.

I would like to express our thanks to the secretary of state for his great work he has invested and still invests in getting this for the peoples of our region. Thank you. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified correspondent] [Words indistinct] list or at least the names of all the Palestinians the PLO has approved for negotiations with Israel?

[Shamir] I don't have, for the moment, I don't have any list of these people you have mentioned, but the secretary told me that he got a list and, in his opinion, all the requirements about the qualities of these people are satisfying.

[Unidentified correspondent] So is that not a problem?

[Shamir] (?It's always) a problem, and we will have to find ways how to check it and draw conclusions. [passage omitted]

Shamir: 'Formidable' Problems in Talks

TA1810073591 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0705 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] A few minutes ago, Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir spoke with United Jewish Appeal [UJA] representatives who are in Jerusalem. He was hinting at several things when he said as follows:

[Begin Shamir recording, in English] We appreciate what's been accomplished in six months of shuttle diplomacy, but, as free people, we of course have the right to differ on certain fundamentals, if necessary. Our discussions were held in a constructive spirit. You understand, I am sure, that some of the problems are formidable, and we are making the utmost effort in the hope that we shall achieve a breakthrough. The discussions with Secretary Baker will continue today. [end recording]

Later, Shamir went on to speak about aliyah, saying this is the most important issue, whatever else may happen.

[Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew at 0705 GMT on 18 October also reports on Shamir's remarks to the UJA members, noting that "in his speech, Prime Minister

Yitzhaq Shamir again mentioned the term Greater Israel, this time explaining, however, that it is absurd to use the term Greater Israel, considering the fact that Israel's width ranges between 10 to 15 or 40 km."]

Levi: 'No Doubt' About Shamir 'Yes'

TA1810120791 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1115 GMT 18 Oct 91

[News conference with Foreign Minister David Levi at the Prime Minister's Office in Jerusalem following the meeting with Secretary Baker—live]

[Text] [Qol Yisra'el correspondent Arye Golan] Are you still optimistic, Mr. Foreign Minister, despite the explosion in today's talks?

[Levi] I do not know. You are asking me about work here. We have done very serious work. We have invested a great deal of effort; we have engaged in intensive efforts at persuasion. We resolved and concluded many of the issues we sought to resolve and conclude. I think that Israel is achieving the best possible conditions, which it never possessed at any time in the past.

[Golan] Why is it necessary to have a cabinet meeting now? Why was it impossible to say yes to Baker and to carry on?

[Levi] Do not forget this is a democratic country. You live here, and the Americans understand this. We will bring our conclusions to the government. We have done our best. We have solved many problems and cleared away many mines. It is not that we will not have problems in the conference and the meetings in the future. The work will be hard, but we are moving forward with self-confidence and are presenting the people with the proof that their government is leading toward peace under the best conditions attainable.

[Tel Aviv IDF Radio correspondent Natan Gutman] Will you recommend to the government on Sunday to say yes to the conference?

[Levi] I surely will, and so will the prime minister. There is no doubt about this.

[Golan] Will you do so although you did not receive the list of the Palestinian representatives? Will the government approve this?

[Levi] This is the end of a chapter in our work which has lasted for many months. Even during the last few days it seemed that everything was going to collapse, but this was not the case. Therefore, if the government—as I am convinced—approves, we will go to this conference, which will mark the beginning of another chapter of our work.

[Golan] How will we know that these representatives, whose identity we do not know, are not PLO people and are not from East Jerusalem? There may be a great deception there, or am I wrong?

[Levi] Do you not rely on the government and the prime minister? The government and the prime minister will abide by the criteria we determined, namely: not the PLO, nobody from the Palestinian diaspora, and nobody from East Jerusalem. These three principles are a test, and in his talk with us, the secretary of state said they will be adhered to in both letter and spirit.

[Golan] Will there be a conference, Mr. Foreign Minister?

[Levi] I hope so. Israel is doing everything possible, while safeguarding its interests. If others will cause the conference to fail, that is their business, and they will be held responsible.

[Gutman] Was what we witnessed here today your, the prime minister's, and the defense minister's yes to the conference?

[Levi] This was the end of this chapter of work. It marked the conclusion of those things we wanted to achieve so that we can come to the government with our recommendation.

[Gutman] A recommendation to go to the conference, of course.

[Levi] A recommendation to go indeed. Have a good day.

Shoval: 'Will Attend Conference'

TA1710192091 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1812 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Impromptu news conference by Zalman Shoval, ambassador to Washington, outside the Prime Minister's Office—live; broadcast in progress]

[Text] [Qol Yisra'el political correspondent Arye Golan] ...Ambassador Shoval, I understand that the talks will continue tomorrow.

[Shoval] The talks will continue tomorrow between our prime minister and ministers and the secretary of state, as well as between the respective aides.

[Golan] Does that mean there are still unresolved problems and that more work is required?

[Shoval] I would not say problems; I would rather say questions. Some issues are still unsolvable, such as the Palestinian delegation and the Palestinian names, which remain a mystery—to them, as well as to us. I can say that progress has been made, and discussions will continue tomorrow.

[Golan] Would you say that progress has been made mainly in the formulations and the revisions of the U.S. letter of assurances to Israel?

[Shoval] Among other things.

[Golan] Can you be more specific?

[Shoval] No, I cannot be more specific. We will continue tomorrow.

[Golan] Has there been any change in the Syrian refusal to participate in the regional conference?

[Shoval] I do not know. That question cannot be directed to me.

[Golan] What is happening with the Palestinian representation? Have you received absolutely no information about their candidates for the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation?

[Shoval] So far, we have received no information on that issue. As you know, that is a key overall issue for the conference.

[Golan] Is the United States willing to guarantee that there will be no deceit, and that the PLO will not suddenly appear in the process?

[Shoval] I will not address that issue. Every agreement made with the United States in the course of the past months remains valid.

[IDF political correspondent Natan Gutman] Will Israel agree to attend the conference without the Palestinian candidates list?

[Shoval] The Israeli Government, the State of Israel will attend the conference on the basis of everything we have agreed upon with the United States during the past months.

[Golan] Does that mean we will attend the conference if agreement is achieved on the noninclusion of the PLO, even if we do not receive a name list?

[Shoval] We will attend on the basis of the agreements.

[Golan] Ambassador Shoval, were you to sum up this long day of talks, which began at 1130 this morning, would you say that progress has been made?

[Shoval] Progress has certainly been made.

[Gutman] Would you say that the central and most problematic issue at the moment is still the Palestinian representation?

[Shoval] I do not want to define it as problematic, because it cannot be resolved as long as we have not received the names. In fact, as long as even the Americans have not received the names, the issue cannot be discussed at all.

[Golan] Are you aware that when these names are eventually received, they will have been sent from Tunisia—no matter what you say?

[Shoval] I do not think so. I propose that we refrain from taking every PLO announcement at face value, because those are made for internal Palestinian consumption.

[Golan] Will the names arrive as a name bank—that is, as a pool of 20 names, or will there be a final list of eight or five Palestinians?

[Shoval] Look, I cannot discuss these things, because we simply do not know yet.

[Unidentified correspondent] As things look now, after a day of talks, will there be a conference by the end of this month?

[Shoval] We hope there will be a peace process. That is our hope.

[Golan] A peace process or a conference in a city named Lausanne, or The Hague, or something else?

[Shoval] What you call a conference is merely a ceremonial opening event where speeches will be given. What matters is that those things have a follow-up. What we are discussing is the follow-up. We hope there will be a peace process.

[Golan] What was the atmosphere like at the talks with Baker today? You, as our ambassador, have witnessed some of our most difficult moments in Washington in recent months.

[Shoval] The atmosphere was very good, and I must say that in the course of the seven or eight times talks were held here, the atmosphere has always been positive, cordial, and friendly.

[Golan] No hint of President Bush's recent tough attitude to Israel on the issue of settlements?

[Shoval] That did not come up in the talks I attended.

[Golan] The issue of settlements was never mentioned at all?

[Shoval] I did not hear it mentioned.

[Golan] Thank you, Ambassador Shoval.

U.S. Letter of Assurances Detailed

TA1710204491 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1832 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By political correspondent Arye Golan]

[Text] The U.S. team, headed by Baker, sprang a surprise on their Israeli interlocutors—Prime Minister Shamir and Ministers Levi and Arens—by proposing the following formulation in the letter of assurances: The United States believes that the Palestinians should be in a joint delegation with Jordan.

The Israelis did not deem the word believes to be sufficiently binding, because Israel insists that the delegation be jointly Jordanian and Palestinian. This is a matter of principle for Israel, and the Israeli leaders expressed categorical objection to this delicate U.S. phrasing. The Americans accepted the Israeli objection,

and the formulation was amended to the following: It is the U.S. stand that the Palestinians should be in a joint delegation with Jordan.

President Ford's letter to former Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin on the Golan Heights issue has been raised again. In that letter, the United States recognized Israel's security needs in the Golan Heights and promised to take them into account when borders are determined. The current formulation proposed by the Americans has been softened to a certain degree, to say this: The United States has no stand on the issue of borders in the Golan Heights that will be determined between Israel and Syria. The U.S. phrasing also states: If and when the United States does have a stand on the issue of Israeli-Syrian borders in the Golan Heights, the Americans will take into account the Israeli position that the border should be situated on the Golan Heights. Thus, the phrasing on the Golan Heights issue is a somewhat refurbished Ford letter.

On the issue of the list of Palestinian candidates to the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to the conference: The Americans have received no list so far, and therefore no discussion of names was held. As we heard Ambassador Shoval state a few minutes ago, the issue will be discussed at 1130 tomorrow morning, on the assumption that by that time the list will have been received.

On the Syrian refusal to participate in the multilateral conference for the solution of regional problems, a genuine problem came up. Yesterday, during the drive from the airport to Jerusalem, Baker told Foreign Minister David Levi that he will try to convince Hafiz al-Asad to attend that conference, which is slated to begin two weeks after the peace conference and the beginning of the direct bilateral negotiations between Israel and each of the Arab countries. Now the Americans are saying: There is a snag, and we are saying that anyone who wants to come will be welcome. Those who do not want to come, will not come. This is the U.S. stand. It should not be viewed as an invitation to the other Arab countries—Jordan, Lebanon, and others—to stay away from the peace conference, but it is certainly a concession to Syria in that its refusal to attend the conference at this time is being accepted unquestionably. Baker has failed to obtain this from Damascus and has presented Jerusalem with the outcome.

Another point to Israel's disadvantage: The United States is not undertaking to have the invitations and the letter of assurances include a stipulation that the negotiations will conclude in the signing of peace accords between Israel and the Arab countries. Syria objects to this, and the United States refused to guarantee such an outcome in advance. The words peace accords will not appear either in the invitations or the letter of assurances.

Baker has announced his intention to remain in the region and in Jerusalem as long as necessary. The talks will continue tomorrow morning.

Palestinians Hold Contacts During Baker Visit

Meet With USSR's Pankin

TA1810060891 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0505 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Report on "unscheduled and unofficial" meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin and Palestinian personalities held "last night," by Moti Amir—live]

[Text] Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin will confer this morning with a 13-member Palestinian delegation, including Faysal al-Husayni and his colleagues, as well as personalities identified with organizations that had opposed talks with Baker and the peace process, such as Dr. Riyad al-Maliki, identified with the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine; and Dr. Nihad al-Masri, identified with Hamas [Islamic Resistance Movement].

Last night, Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin preceded Secretary Baker in conferring with the Palestinians in East Jerusalem. At the end of the meeting, which lasted nearly three hours, Faysal al-Husayni said that the meeting was held at the initiative of the Palestinians, who wished to coordinate positions with Minister Pankin prior to his meeting this morning with Secretary Baker.

[Begin al-Husayni recording] This was the first time we have talked to the Soviets since the beginning of the peace move. They have constant contacts with the PLO, but this is the first time here, so we wanted to know what they intend to say and also wanted them to know what we have to say. An important meeting is scheduled tomorrow between Pankin and Baker, and we wished to know, coordinate, and give him the correct information before he concludes the matter with Baker. [end recording]

At the end of the meeting, Minister Pankin said that one of the major items that was discussed was the preparations for the peace conference.

[Begin Pankin recording, in English] We have been discussing the matter of preparation to the conference. I told you it is the main issue, the most important issue, and we are going to see each other tomorrow also, because it is another matter we have to decide from the talks. [end recording]

'Surprises' in Palestinian List

TA1710210991 Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Hebrew 1900 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By Arab affairs correspondent Ehud Ya'ari]

[Excerpt] The list of the Palestinian representatives to the peace conference was being completed as Secretary of State Baker was sitting down with Prime Minister Shamir. The list has 14 names, and includes quite a few surprises. It includes some people who were not even

mentioned until now in all the speculation. Other people who were considered certain candidates are left out. The list is scheduled to be handed to Baker during his meeting early tomorrow morning with Faysal al-Husayni and his colleagues. The preparation of the list was concluded today in consultations between Tunis and Ramallah, where 30 representatives of the various Palestinian factions were convened, including the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine [PFLP], but excluding Hamas [Islamic Resistance Movement], whose members were busy scrawling diatribes against al-Husayni and Hanan 'Ashrawi on the walls. The list, we were told, is the result of give and take between the residents of the territories and the PLO, and not some arbitrary dictate from Tunis. During the day, al-Husayni and his colleagues met with Baker's advisers and made some progress toward consolidating the U.S. letter of assurances to the Palestinians. Prior to the conference, al-Husayni is asking for assurances that Israel will not harm the members of the Palestinian delegation and not disrupt their freedom of action. The Palestinians are also asking that flags not be flown in the conference hall if they are not permitted to fly a Palestinian flag. All the issues of permits, security arrangements, and other logistical issues pertaining to the conference were all finalized with the Americans.

The Jordanian-Palestinian delegation will have two chairmen. The Palestinians believe that a way will be found to guarantee them equal status with the other delegations, so that they do not appear subordinate members of the Jordanian delegation. Now everyone is waiting for the official announcement from the PLO's Central Council, made up of 90 members, which is currently meeting at a secret location in Tunis. The decision on Palestinian participation in the peace conference has to come from here, and only afterward will Faysal al-Husayni be free to deliver the prepared list to Baker. Last-minute name changes are still possible. However, Dr. Zakariya al-Agha and Dr. Furayh Abu-Mudayn will be coming from Gaza, while Dr. Sa'ib 'Urayqat will be coming from the West Bank—even though he claims he is not interested in participating—and so will Ziyad Abu-Zayyad, Dr. Mamduh al-'Akr, most probably Ilyas Frayj, and others.

At the opening of the conference, 'Arafat said that the Palestinians must show flexibility without undermining their principles. It is clear that the PFLP will not send a representative to the delegation. The Communists and the members of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine in the territories are still hesitating but will eventually cave in to the orders from Tunis, and therefore Dr. Ghassan al-Khatib, the Communist from Ramallah, and Sami al-Kilani will figure among the participants. All this comes against the background of a rift revealed today by Dr. Sari Nusaybah, who took part in the talks with Baker and said today that there were disagreements between him and al-Husayni and 'Ashrawi. Nusaybah, unlike the others, does not feel that there has been any change for the better in the U.S. position regarding the Palestinians.

It goes without saying, PLO spokesmen have stressed, that the PLO has no intention of working to weaken the intifadah at this stage. As agreed upon with Jordan, the Palestinians intend to demand that settlement activity stop as soon as the conference starts. This was reported today by PLO official Abu-Mazin [Mahmud 'Abbas], upon his return from Amman. This has also been confirmed by other sources.

This is compatible with the scenario mentioned to the United States by the Syrians. We have learned that Syrian President al- Asad presented Baker with a scenario for negotiations. Following pressure on Israel to stop the settlements, priority would be given to achieving an autonomy agreement for the Palestinians. Later, and this is the main point, al-Asad proposed that priority be given to achieving a comprehensive agreement between Syria and Israel regarding the Golan Heights. His demand for a total withdrawal is well known, but the novelty lies in the fact that he is willing to reach a separate Syrian-Israeli agreement immediately following interim arrangements in the territories and without waiting for a comprehensive agreement on the future of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. In other words, Syria is signaling Israel, through Baker, that it is not making an agreement of its own with Israel conditional on a final solution to the Palestinian problem. [passage omitted]

News Briefing on Baker Talks

TA1810095491 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0840 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Report on news conference held by members of the Palestinian delegation who met with Secretary of State Baker at Faysal al-Husayni's house in East Jerusalem on 18 October by Moti Amir—live; remarks by the Palestinians are in English; broadcast in progress where indicated by ellipses]

[Text] [Amir] At this very moment, Dr. Riyad al-Maliki, who is identified with the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, is expressing at this news conference his opposition to the process.

[Al-Maliki] ....to the whole public opinion, and I will do my best in order to prevent such deterioration in the Palestinian basic fundamental principles.

[Amir] Dr. al-Maliki is saying he will do everything he can to prevent the conference, which he says suppresses or fails to meet the Palestinians' demands.

'Ali Abu-Hilal, the deportee who was recently allowed to return to the territories, also appeared at this news conference. Other Palestinians are now entering the home of Faysal al-Husayni to continue the consultations. All the nine representatives who met with Baker this morning are holding consultations here and are waiting for their talk with Boris Pankin.

In his remarks, Abu-Hilal listed all the problems which remained unanswered in the Palestinians' talks with

Baker, including the East Jerusalem issue, a settlement freeze, and the Palestinian people's right to self-determination. He, too, did not sound too happy about the entire process.

Another speaker at this news conference is Dr. Ghassan al-Khatib, a member of the Communist Party. Let us hear what he is saying:

[Al-Khatib] ....implementing in different fronts. In other words, I would like to make sure that this conference is another front in which the Palestinians will fight through peaceful means, according to international legitimacy, to achieve their goals, objectives, which are completely legitimate by any means.

[Amir] Dr. al-Khatib is saying that the peace conference is another legitimate tool for the realization of Palestinian rights. Let us hear another portion of his remarks:

[Al-Khatib] We work according to our agenda, according to Palestinian national agenda, not according to the agenda of anybody else.

[Unidentified correspondent, in English] But you don't have enough time till the end of the month.

[Al-Khatib] We are trying our best to come up with the final results as soon as possible, but at the same time, we want these results to be well prepared in order to achieve the maximum achievements.

[Amir] Well, then, Dr. al-Khatib is also not too pleased with the talks his colleagues held with Secretary Baker, but the remarks he is making indicate that the Communist Party may indeed join the process.

There are no Hamas [Islamic Resistance Movement] representatives here. All efforts yesterday to convince them to come to discuss matters at Faysal al-Husayni's house failed. All the nine who held talks with Secretary Baker, including Faysal al-Husayni, are convened in the house, together with some additional people: 'Ali Abu-Hilal, Dr. Ghassan al-Khatib, and Dr. Riyad al-Maliki.

[Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew at 0905 GMT on 18 October adds that "regarding his displeasure with the current talks, Dr. Riyad al-Maliki said he is displeased by the fact that there is no state, there is no self-determination, and there are many concessions."]

'Disaster' If Israel Sees Names

TA1810111091 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1047 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Statement by Faysal al-Husayni, who emerges to meet the press in front of the National Palace Hotel in East Jerusalem during a recess in the meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin—live in English; broadcast in progress]

[Text] ....in front of the Israeli Government, it means that the whole peace process will be in dangers. No one can use any names to give the Israelis the opportunity to make veto or to decide who will be from the Palestinian side. So we are saying here: No one can discuss the Palestinian delegation but the Palestinians, and if any other party will try to do such, so he will put the whole peace process in a danger, and it is not our fault.

As I told you, we discussed names that can be, but we didn't make anything more than that. Any try to use this opportunity from the Israelis to make vetoes or to deal or to say anything about such a matter is refused completely.

I am not waiting for any response. As I told you, these names were discussed as names which can be in the delegation. If the Israelis will have the opportunity to look, to discuss, or to deal with it, so here we are in front of disaster. Thank you.

Soviet Foreign Minister Pankin Arrives

TA1710114591 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1102 GMT 17 Oct 91

[By Ge'ula Even from Ben-Gurion Airport—live]

[Excerpts] At this very moment, USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin, accompanied by his wife, is disembarking from the plane. He shakes hands with David Levi, and they are both smiling. [passage omitted]

Pankin and Levi will go from here to the Yad Vashem Museum, and later they will have a working session in the Foreign Ministry in Jerusalem. Pankin will later meet with Defense Minister Arens and Justice Minister Meridor. He will have dinner with Foreign Minister Levi. [passage omitted]

Pankin, Levi Statements

TA1710121491 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1103 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Remarks by Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin and Foreign Minister David Levi at Ben-Gurion Airport following Pankin's arrival—live; Pankin remarks in Russian followed by passage-by-passage translation into English, processed from the English; broadcast in progress]

[Text] [Pankin] ....If we are to put an end to military confrontation, mutual recrimination, and mistrust in the region, we have to launch a full-fledged negotiating process. We have to start bringing down psychological and other barriers. [Words indistinct] (?peoples) and nations of the region. We firmly believe that the process of peace will help us all arrive at a mutually acceptable compromise based on [words indistinct]. Our country has traditionally maintained long-standing, sound, and meaningful relations with your region. Therefore, it stands to reason that we have a vested interest in bringing peace and stability.

Developments in the region and in the world at large have also brought us to a crucial point in the bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and Israel.

For our part, we stand ready to do our best to remove the barriers that stood in the way of formal, civilized relations among our nations and to bring our relations to a level consistent with the interests of our nations and the interests of peace in the region and elsewhere.

I am looking forward to meaningful and productive discussions with the prime minister of Israel, Mr. Yitzhaq Shamir; my counterpart, Foreign Minister David Levi; [words indistinct]. We will also have an opportunity to continue our extensive dialogue with Mr. James Baker of the United States. We will then be proceeding to Damascus, Amman, and Cairo. I am hopeful that all these discussions will help us move closer to our shared goal, the convening of a peace conference on the Middle East.

[Levi, broadcast in midsentence] ....and your wife and party. Here we will be able to pick up where we left off in New York, when we discussed the important issues involving our two nations and the mutual effort we must invest together both in order to conclude the issue that is on the agenda, and to boost our diplomatic relations and raise them forthwith to the higher level befitting our two nations.

We will have an opportunity to talk about bilateral and regional issues and their international import. Israel initiated a peace process and has made a tremendous and marked effort to crown it with success, but this success does not depend on us alone. We hope that common sense will touch the hearts and minds of our neighbors so that we can, perhaps, finally reach the end of the hardships and the wars and begin the unfolding of a new era of hope and peace, which can offer this region a better reality: constructiveness instead of ruin, and life instead of death. This will be the test for all of us.

Sir, let us welcome you on your arrival with the traditional blessing: Welcome to Israel. [applause]

Joint Statement After Meeting

TA1710175591 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1741 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Joint statement by Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin and Foreign Minister David Levi—live; statement read out by unidentified officials in Russian, English, and Hebrew; processed from English]

[Text] A meeting has just been concluded between Foreign Minister Pankin and Minister Levi. In the course of a discussion by the two ministers, which took place in a frank and constructive atmosphere, a wide range of issues was discussed of interest to both sides; in particular, a thorough exchange of views took place on the situation in the region, on launching a peace process in the Middle East.

The state of bilateral relations between the USSR and Israel was also reviewed, including the reestablishment of full diplomatic relations. It has been agreed that the discussion of this issue will be continued tomorrow in the same constructive spirit.

Pankin Urged To Press Syria

TA1710205391 Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Hebrew 1900 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Israel expects the Soviet Union to use its influence in Syria to convince Damascus to participate in the multilateral talks. This statement was made this evening by Foreign Minister David Levi to his Soviet colleague Boris Pankin during their meeting in Jerusalem. After a visit to the Old City of Jerusalem, the Soviet foreign minister this afternoon arrived at the Foreign Ministry for talks on the peace process and bilateral relations between the two countries. Our correspondent Dan Semama reports that Boris Pankin noted the great chance for peace that must not be missed and said that he considers the role of cochairman at the peace conference, shared by the Soviet Union with the United States, as a compliment.

In the meeting, Foreign Minister David Levi said that it was regrettable that while we were being told that Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the Gulf states, and apparently also the Maghreb countries would participate in the multilateral talks, Syria was still bound by its traditional positions. Syria's extreme policy would lead to its isolation.

The two foreign ministers discussed the intention to raise the level of diplomatic relations between the two countries, and it was agreed that the discussions on this issue would continue tomorrow. Our correspondent reports that at the Foreign Ministry it is hoped that the USSR would announce the resumption of full diplomatic relations between the two countries tomorrow.

Levi Speaks at Banquet

TA1710212991 Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Hebrew 1930 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Address by Foreign Minister David Levi at a "banquet in honor of Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin at the King David Hotel in Jerusalem"—live; broadcast in progress]

[Text] ...during those fateful hours opposite tanks, with the voice of freedom crying out in their hearts and paralyzing the war machine. These are the contemporary heroes, who have proved [words indistinct] who were out to oppress this noble spirit. Pankin was one of those people.

Therefore, it was but natural for me to have been proud to meet him in New York and to discuss the beautiful hours that gave mankind a new hope. We are following everything happening in your country, sir. With anxiety and concern, we followed those difficult days, all the

while praying for your victory, because your victory is the victory of the values in which we also believe: democracy, freedom, and liberty.

We appreciate your stand on the exit of our brethren from there and on their return to their country and homeland here. They have enriched our life here with a blend of the Jewish and the Soviet spirits, with Russian songs and experience, and with the tremendous potential they absorbed there, which is so unique to them, sons of the Jewish people.

Sir, you are visiting us today. As we were making our way to Jerusalem, I was excited to learn how well acquainted you are with that city from the Bible and how ardently you desire to visit the holy sites. And, indeed, you went to see the beautiful mosaic of that city of peace, capital of Israel, the city of David. You have toured the Old City and seen the Jewish Quarter, the Western Wall, and the gutted building that bears testimony to what others had done to my forefathers before banishing them into exile. You could hear me tell you about the great ingathering of the diaspora into Zion, of the rebuilding of this beautiful country.

We have been through ordeals, but we have always had one hope in our hearts: God, let there be peace in this country. It was preordained that we should be strong, in order to win, in order to survive, because in this region, a weakling is doomed to perish, doomed to be oppressed, doomed to be downtrodden. We saw this around us, and we realized that we had no choice but to develop a protective power that would enable us to survive as a democracy and as a peace- and freedom-seeking nation in this region.

Today we are marching toward an event that we all hope will be a historic process capable of finally bringing the much-desired peace to this region. Peace is the most sacred blessing, which we all cherish in our hearts from early youth to old age. Let there be peace in this country! The path is arduous, and we will have to endure ordeals. We have made the first step. We believe that common sense will prevail around us and that we will able to see the materialization of this dream for the benefit of the entire region.

Today we have held good and productive discussions in what you have termed a constructive and friendly atmosphere. I was extremely glad to hear that you accepted my suggestion to set up a supreme economic committee at our two ministries that will examine ideas and projects for cooperation between our two countries. We can cooperate in many areas. I regard the period during which our relations were severed as a historic accident, and we should take expeditious action to make up for lost time and to fill the future with significance.

I was equally glad today to receive your document detailing principles underlying the resumption of full relations between our two countries. I, together with my associates, appreciate this very much. Tomorrow we will continue our debates in the same spirit, and I hope they will end with good tidings.

These values, which unite us—the Soviet song which is in the heart and on the lips of every Israeli, the directness and the love of life characteristic of the Russian and of the Russian Jew—we learned all these here in our country....[reporter's voicover obscures Levi's concluding remarks]

Pankin Responds

TA1710220291 Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Hebrew 1940 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Address by Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin at a "banquet hosted by Foreign Minister David Levi" at the King David Hotel in Jerusalem—live, in Russian; broadcast in process]

[Text] ...what he [Foreign Minister Levi] called a heroic deed but what I believe is a standard act of a regular guy, a son of his homeland. I believe those three days were the outcome of some sort of a past, some sort of a life. I could quote Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who said at a news conference [words indistinct]: What have you done with Pankin? He was always considered a democrat, and you have turned him into a regular revolutionary. [laughter] I liked hearing this appraisal, but any merit ascribed to me should be chalked up to the credit of Prague and Czechoslovakia. When I heard those warm words, I felt embarrassed that people who had sacrificed decades of their life in the service of the democratic idea should speak about me in those terms.

I would like to mention something else, something we discussed with Minister Levi, professors, academicians, and diplomats. Well, I spoke a little about what our family went through....[passage indistinct, obscured by reporter's voiceover]...our friends, particularly writers and artists. Physically it was not very convenient, because our home used to become a real mess, but spiritually, it was very pleasant. We liked hosting Georgians, Circassians, Nogais, and Ukrainians.

Then I was made an envoy to Sweden. It happened about three months prior to the demise of Brezhnev; I liked Sweden. (?Seven) years later, I was sent to Czechoslovakia, with which I promptly fell in love. A year later [words indistinct] the president appointed me....[broadcast ends]

Aide Churkin on Renewed Ties

TA1810055591 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in English 0500 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] The USSR intends to announce the renewal of diplomatic relations with Israel today. This is according to a senior Foreign Ministry source in Jerusalem. Soviet Foreign Minister Pankin is scheduled to meet Foreign Minister Levi this afternoon.

The Soviet foreign minister's spokesman, Vitaliy Churkin, last night was not prepared to disclose when relations would be restored, and dismissed the notion that there was a direct link with the peace conference. But it is clear from his remarks that the issue is close to resolution. He was speaking to reporter Gid'on Remez:

[Begin recording] [Churkin] Our relations have been developing pretty well, and we're hopeful that the goal we all have in mind will be finally accomplished.

[Remez] Is there a kind of chicken-and-egg situation here, whether Israel will accept the invitation to the conference first or the USSR will renew diplomatic relations first?

[Churkin] No, it's not a matter of.... [changes thought] There is no direct relationship. Simply, we want it to be the right moment. The issue is so big and so important that we would like it to be done in a way which would be best for everybody. We're simply trying to do that.

[Remez] Could you specify which problems that you mentioned still remain to be worked out?

[Churkin] There are no problems; they need to do some more talking and, again, there are no obstacles, no problems, no preconditions or anything, but we need to do it properly, and they need some time to discuss it.

[Remez] Is it your impression that Ministers Pankin and Baker will be able to issue invitations tomorrow, after their meeting, to all sides for the conference?

[Churkin] Well, that I cannot say. We need to get together with Baker and have solid, substantive, long discussion, and we'll see. [end recording]

[Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew at 0505 GMT on 18 October carries a similar report on Churkin's remarks, providing the following additional recorded remarks by Churkin in English: "We feel that as one of the two superpowers, we have a responsibility. We have been working very well with the Americans on that matter. Minister Pankin and Minister Levi, they talked about the role of the two future cochairmen of the future peace conference, and from what I heard Mr. Levi say, he saw it as a very important role. We regard it as also much more than ceremonial role of opening a peace conference. We are going to play an active and important role in the Middle East." On the Syrians, Churkin says: "I hope you all realize that they have gone a long way, and I would think they are genuinely interested in peace and in having the peace conference as setting another ball rolling. Of course, we think that there is a big future in our relations with Syria."]

Shamir, Right-Wing Parties Confer on Conference

TA1810103591 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 0925 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Report from the Prime Minister's Office by Knesset correspondent Dov Gilhar, moderated by Ya'el Dan—live]

[Text] [Gilhar] Shalom from the Prime Minister's Office, where a tripartite meeting between Ministers Yuval Ne'eman of Tehiya, Rehav'am Ze'evi of Moledet, and Refa'el Eytan of Tzomet with Prime Minister Shamir has just ended. Minister Eytan has already left, but we have Minister Yuval Ne'eman, the leader of the Tehiya: What can you tell us after the meeting?

[Ne'eman] We expressed our deep concern and reiterated to the prime minister our demand that Israel not go to the conference. As will be recalled, we voted against this. We heard explanations from the prime minister about various points we raised.

[Gilhar] So is Israel going to the conference? Did you hear anything from the prime minister?

[Ne'eman] No, I will not divulge what he told us; we will leave this for his bureau to release.

[Gilhar] What about your own feelings? Are we going to the conference, after all you heard?

[Ne'eman] I do not know. I say that from our point of view, we received certain clarifications. My assessment, from the Tehiya's standpoint, is that the situation remains unchanged. Obviously we will not want to be part of the government if it arrives at the stage of discussing such issues as autonomy or territorial issues.

[Gilhar] The question is very clear and specific now: Secretary Baker is expected at the prime minister's bureau shortly, possibly bearing names of Palestinian representatives who endorsed the peace conference. No doubt you heard something from the prime minister about his answer to Baker. What will you in the Tehiya do if Israel goes to the conference? Will you quit the coalition now or will you wait?

[Ne'eman] We will pull out of the government, but I will propose to the party's Central Committee that we quit sometime before the negotiations actually begin.

[Gilhar] When will Tehiya meet on this?

[Ne'eman] On Sunday [20 October].

[Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew at 0944 GMT on 18 October also carries a live interview with Minister Yuval Ne'eman. To the question of whether he is now more relieved than before he met Shamir, he says: "Definitely not." Asked whether Tehiya will now take action to call early elections, Ne'eman says: "We would certainly be happy if there were early elections."]

[Dan] But the decision on withdrawal involves the three right-wing parties, so my question is: When will that decision be made?

[Gilhar] To answer that, we have Minister Rehav'am Ze'evi. Minister Ne'eman gave us a picture of what his movement, the Tehiya, will do, saying that a decision will be made on Sunday. What did you hear from the prime minister: Is Israel going to the peace conference?

[Ze'evi] What the prime minister told us behind closed doors is something about which you must ask him; I am not his spokesman and will not snitch. I can only say that we had two reasons for wanting to see him, and both were satisfied: First, we wanted to hear from him more about the process, the problems that exist, the chances and the risks; second, we wanted to report to him our comments and sentiments about the process.

[Gilhar] Are you now more worried, in view of the prime minister's answers?

[Ze'evi] No, I still maintain my old position. I heard from him once again one thing which I am happy to quote over and over again, namely that Prime Minister Shamir has been and remains faithful to Eretz Yisra'el and that he will not cede any part of Eretz Yisra'el, either in a conference or in any negotiations.

[Gilhar] You know, the riddle whose answer both you and Minister Ne'eman have been keeping secret is whether or not Israel is proceeding to the peace conference. Maybe you heard something about it. Perhaps you can at least tell us whether Moledet will leave the coalition as a result of what the prime minister told you? Could you tell us that?

[Ze'evi] First of all, for Israel to go to the conference, there must first be a formal cabinet session. What Prime Minister Shamir and Secretary of State Baker agree upon today will indicate the bent, but this will still not be a formal decision. The cabinet will meet next week to reach a decision on the matter. I presume the conference will take place, but I hope it will be torpedoed somehow, though I do not know how. The Lord above still looks out for Israel.

[Gilhar] Will Moledet remain in the government?

[Ze'evi] Like its sisters, Moledet will remain in the coalition as long as territorial concessions are not discussed and Palestinian autonomy in Judaea, Samaria, and Gaza is not mentioned. Once these issues are broached, all three movements will find themselves outside the government.

[Gilhar] Thank you very much, Minister Ze'evi.

[Dan] Minister Eytan, let me ask you this: What happened in your meeting with Shamir that led you to the decision not to quit now?

[Eytan] The issue was not on the agenda. We were briefed by the prime minister and aired our views. That is all.

[Dan] Were you favorably surprised by what Shamir told you? Can you tell me that, at least? After all, we know about your rather serious resolve to quit. Did what you heard favorably surprise or calm you? Did the remarks make you decide to defer the withdrawal?

[Eytan] From what we heard, there is no reason to take any step at this moment.

Arens Sees Two Questions in Baker Talks

TA1810063891 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0505 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Telephone interview with Defense Minister Moshe Arens by political correspondent Arye Golan—live]

[Text] [Golan] Good morning to you, Defense Minister Moshe Arens.

[Arens] Good morning.

[Golan] Defense Minister Arens, at the moment, what is holding up a positive response to Secretary of State Baker?

[Arens] There are two questions here. You referred to one of them today: the composition of the Palestinian delegation. There is no doubt that the PLO will try to break its way into the conference and negotiations. We—both us and the Americans, of course—should be careful about this. The second question concerns the Syrians, who announced that they refuse to take part in negotiations on regional arrangements in spheres such as disarmament, water problems, the war against terrorism, and so on and so forth. They are prepared only for direct negotiations with us, and I assume they expect us to withdraw from the Golan Heights in the wake of these negotiations. This is a change, and not for the better.

[Golan] Minister Arens, before we talk about Syria, let us discuss the PLO. Even if its people do not sit in the conference hall, the spirit of this organization hovers over the deliberations all the time. The list the Palestinians are slated to hand to Baker this morning is being issued by Tunis in one way or another, after all. How are we coping with this? How is the Israeli Government, which decided it does not talk to the PLO, coping with this matter?

[Arens] Look, it is very difficult to cope with spirits, but we can cope and are coping with tangible elements.

[Golan] In other words, we do not care who the Palestinians consult and who gives them their instructions?

[Arens] I would not want to say what we do and do not care about. One can define only those things that can be implemented and which are important. We do not want to see PLO people in this conference. As you know, the PLO is greatly displeased about this matter; therefore, it is to be expected that they will try to break their way into the conference.

[Golan] Minister Arens, will an official announcement from Tunisia that the PLO approves the participation of the residents of the territories in the conference be considered a direct link between the Palestinian delegates from the territories and the PLO?

[Arens] We pay no attention to and ignore everything that is going on in Tunis. We do not view the elements there as a party to the negotiations. They may say what they want, but it is totally irrelevant.

[Golan] There was talk about an advisory committee made up of people such as Faysal al-Husayni and Hanan 'Ashrawi, who are considered Jerusalemites, that will participate in the opening session in the position of advisers.

[Arens] No advisory committee was discussed with us in the talks with Mr. Baker yesterday.

[Golan] Will Israel agree to this?

[Arens] I cannot conduct the negotiations with you, can I?

[Golan] Minister Arens, on Syria's refusal to come to multilateral talks on regional problems, it seems that in yesterday's talks Secretary of State Baker said: Let whoever does not want to come to the multilateral conference not come. Is this our approach, too, or could this still be an obstacle in our way to joining the peace conference?

[Arens] He may have said this to the Syrians, but we must decide our position.

[Golan] What is our position on this issue?

[Arens] Well, this is a problematic issue which requires careful consideration on our part, because it raises a question about the extent of Syrian willingness to reach peace negotiations.

[Golan] Could Syria's refusal to undertake in advance to join such a conference be a cause for Israel not to join the regional conference?

[Arens] First, this deviates from the general principles that were determined between us and the secretary of state and between the secretary of state and the Arab elements regarding the process.

[Golan] Another question, Minister Arens: What will happen if we are faced with a joint Arab and U.S. demand for a settlement freeze as a goodwill gesture immediately upon the opening of the peace conference?

[Arens] I do not expect this. After all, we are holding continual contacts with the Americans. We sat with Mr. Baker yesterday and will resume our talks with him today. He did not hint at that, nor did he say a single word about such a possibility. Our position on this issue is well known.

[Golan] Thank you, Defense Minister Moshe Arens, and good morning.

Netanyahu Doubts Syrian Intentions on Peace

TA1710202291 Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Arabic 1700 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Binyamin Netanyahu by Shlomo Ganor on 17 October, "a short while ago"—recorded in Hebrew with Arabic subtitles]

[Text] [Ganor] Mr. Minister, how are things looking this evening in the talks with Secretary of State Baker?

[Netanyahu] We are in the midst of a process that is not yet over. First, it would be advisable to know what we are heading toward. From the very beginning we assumed—and we still see things this way today—that the purpose is to achieve peace, a contractual peace agreement between Israel and Syria, just like the one we reached with Egypt. Apparently that is not the way the Syrians regard the matter. They refuse to make a clear declaration that that is the goal. Second, the way to reach this goal. Through direct talks without preconditions. That also is not clear. How do you enter direct negotiations? Questions that pertain to both the essence and technique have not, regrettably, all been ironed out yet. We still lack certain details and understandings.

[Ganor] Do these take the form of disagreements that affect the rate of progress?

[Netanyahu] Of course they have an effect. We did not come here to discuss abstracts. We came to talk—as we have always wanted to—about ending the state of war between Israel and the Arab world. They have been in a state of war with us for approximately 50 years, and now they are ostensibly ready to come to the negotiating table. It is still unclear, however, just how they intend to come, and for what. Do they want to enter negotiations just to take the territories away from Israel, as the Syrian foreign minister said? That is not our goal. Israel's aim is to achieve peace. We can argue about the ways and means or about what each party will have to give up. We shall definitely argue about that. There should be no argument, however, about whether or not we intend to reach a peace agreement. Apparently, however, there is some disagreement on that issue.

[Ganor] The news agencies are reporting from Tunis that the PLO has nominated the Palestinian representatives and that they are all residents of the territories—for example, Ilyas Frayj and Ziyad Abu-Zayyad. Would you be willing to comment on those names, Mr. Deputy Foreign Minister, and on other names?

[Netanyahu] I will not comment on names, because the PLO will certainly announce every name and declare that it is behind them. Israel, however, will not negotiate with PLO men. We will not negotiate with people who are PLO members or who identify with its program. This is for a simple reason: We are ready to talk to any Arab, including Palestinian Arabs, except those who want us dead. If someone seeks to use the political discussions only as a means for our destruction, or as a stage toward it, then he is not a partner for peace. However, Israel will certainly be able to talk with people who want to negotiate with us in order to live with us.

[Ganor] How then can we overcome the obstacle posed by the composition of the Palestinian delegation?

[Netanyahu] I will not discuss that now, but the principle is clear.

[Ganor] Mr. Deputy Foreign Minister, what about the Syrian opposition to participating in the regional conference two weeks after the opening of the peace conference? Does this place the very holding of the peace conference at risk?

[Netanyahu] This leads to very grave doubts regarding Syria's intentions. In the absence of a Syrian intention to move toward true peace, we cannot make much progress. If the Syrians refuse to declare that the goal is peace, if they refuse to participate in talks that any neighboring countries with good intentions would take part in—talks on issues such as water, communications, environmental matters—if they refuse to take part in this, then what are they thinking about? What is in their head? What kind of peace are they talking about? With Israel or without Israel?

[Ganor] Would you this evening say that we are close to holding the conference or that we are still some distance away?

[Netanyahu] I thought that we were very close. I thought that we were close to convening an opening session that would lead to direct negotiations to achieve peace. I must tell you that I want to believe that this optimism was justified, but on the basis of what I have been hearing from Syria and from other parts of the Arab world, I cannot tell you that this is the case. We will see in the coming days.

[Ganor] Assuming that the gaps between the parties' positions are bridged, where will the conference be held? Can you tell us this evening where and when the conference will be held?

[Netanyahu] I suggest that we wait with this. The question of the conference's location is interesting, but I am sure that you will agree that it is a minor issue. The fundamental questions are the purpose of the conference and how it will be convened. To my regret, we have still not received satisfactory answers to those questions at this point.

[Ganor] What is the probability that the U.S. and Soviet Presidents will participate in the opening session?

[Netanyahu] Once more, I will not get into details about the structure of the conference. The opening will be a media event, whatever the case. It is designated to serve as an opening for bilateral peace negotiations. Let us first agree about that, and then we can fill in the other details.

[Ganor] So you still do not believe that the conference will be held at the end of the month?

[Netanyahu] I am no prophet; however, I say that the main thing is not to discuss probabilities but to discuss principles, and I just spelled out the principles: Israel wants to see the Arab world, at least that part of it that wants to enter a political process with us, clearly declare that it wants peace and supports the accepted means of peacemaking, as practiced throughout history and in current international diplomacy.

[Ganor] The Soviet foreign minister began talks here this evening. What are Jerusalem's expectations of the meetings with Mr. Pankin?

[Netanyahu] Well, it is no secret. We have been talking with the Soviets for some time about upgrading relations to the level of full embassies in both capitals, and I hope that will indeed be the case. I would not like to deny the Soviet minister the opportunity to make his own statements to us. We will listen to what he has to say and then respond.

[Ganor] And we expect to hear those statements tomorrow?

[Netanyahu] What is important to understand is that the USSR is changing its traditional policy toward Israel. Once its policy was hostile, and no Soviet foreign minister would have come to Israel. We welcome the change but would of course like to see its full political expression through the upgrading of relations. That is exactly what we have told the Soviets.

[Ganor] Thank you, Mr. Deputy Foreign Minister.

U.S. Assurances on Settlements, Jerusalem Wanted

JN1410130991 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1200 GMT 14 Oct 91

[Randah Habib dispatch from Amman]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will arrive in Amman today. He will meet with Jordan's monarch King Husayn this afternoon at a stage described as decisive prior to the convening of the peace conference.

According to informed sources, Jordan will ask the U.S. side questions related to the minute details of the conference, such as the language that will be used at the conference, the number of participating delegations, and the duration of speeches that will be delivered at the opening session.

Jordanian Foreign Minister Kamil Abu-Jabir told our radio that his country would like to obtain more detailed U.S. assurances regarding the issue of Jerusalem and the need to halt Israeli settlements. Abu-Jabir wondered about the usefulness of the negotiations if these settlements do not stop. We asked the Jordanian foreign minister about Baker's Jordanian stop, which is said to be the easiest, due to Jordan's commitment from the beginning to the peace process. The minister said:

[Begin recording] I have several remarks, the first in fact about the word "easy". It might be the easiest. However, it could also be the most difficult in light of Jordan's commitment to a number of constants which it cannot relinquish, such as the issue of settlements and Jerusalem, etc. The second point on which I would like to comment is actually based on his majesty the king's address to his people at the national congress two days ago when he analyzed the general situation of the peace process against the background of a triangle whose parties are America, Israel, and the Arab side.

In his analysis of the new American situation, his majesty said that there have been international changes since the mid-eighties and since President Gorbachev, who took these changes into consideration, assumed power in the USSR and then the emergence of the so-called new world order and President Bush's commitment to the peace issue, particularly in the wake of the Gulf crisis. For the first time in the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict throughout the last four or five decades, we find a U.S. President who actually seems to have a moral, serious, and political commitment regarding an attempt or an endeavor to achieve a settlement of all aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The second factor [as heard] is the Israeli factor, which is represented by a state that seems to be still insisting on adopting a certain rightist ideology that is difficult to change. Therefore, efforts should be pooled, not only the American, Arab, or Soviet efforts, but also the international moves to try to change this Israeli position, which insists on certain items.

The third factor which his majesty spoke about is the Arab situation and the Arab commitment since 1967 toward the peace issue and the demand for a just and comprehensive peace, and a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict based on Resolutions 242 and 338 and the principle of land for peace. [end recording]

Cabinet Reviews Talks

JN1710155391 Amman PETRA-JNA in Arabic 1510 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Amman, 17 Oct (PETRA)—At noon today, the cabinet convened a session to review the outcome of political efforts to bring peace to the Middle East on the basis of international legitimacy, the Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territory, and the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

The review addressed the results of the talks held in Amman with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, a PLO delegation, and Palestinian figures from the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip.

Baker Should 'Stop Appeasement'

JN1810085191 Amman SAWT AL-SHA'B in Arabic 18 Oct 91 pp 1, 13

[Editorial: "Baker Should Change His Tone in Talks With Shamir"]

[Text] In his talks in Israel to overcome the obstacles to a peace conference placed by the Shamir government, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker is once again encountering the Likud government's disgusting ideological intransigence and rigidity.

Despite the assertions of the U.S. secretary and the Shamir government, that substantial progress has been achieved in the talks, the resumption of talks today, at variance with Baker's program, indicates that the talks have encountered difficulties, especially since no agreement has yet been reached on Palestinian representation and other issues which the Shamir government is showing no flexibility on. This may to a great extent affect the results of these talks.

Evidently, Baker's leniency toward this religious and political ideological rigidity, which grips the behavior of Shamir and his government, is the reason behind the persistence in Israel's intransigence. Thus, Baker is required to change his tone and to stop appeasement, which cannot be received by Shamir in its true sense.

The U.S. secretary is required to use new language containing more pressure than promises of political and financial support or pro-Israeli bias.

If he wants the U.S. initiative to attain the aspired-for results, and if he wants his mission to be successful, the U.S. secretary should face the Shamir government with the new facts which oblige both Washington and Tel Aviv to either abide by the resolutions of international legality, or give up hopes for peace as a whole. This is because the Arab side cannot accept a defective peace,

not based on the principles of complete Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and the establishment of the Palestinian people's legitimate rights.

Since the U.S. secretary is aware of this principled Arab and Palestinian stand, he should make this position understood to Shamir and the pillars of his backward Likudist government.

To continue appeasing Israel and leaving it unrestrained will neither secure success for Baker's mission or Bush's initiative, nor will it achieve a just peace.

Soviet Foreign Minister To Visit 20-21 Oct

NC1710114591 Paris AFP in English 1125 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Amman, Oct 17 (AFP)—Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin will visit Amman Sunday and Monday as part of U.S. and Soviet efforts to convene a Middle East peace conference by the end of the month, an official source said Thursday.

Pankin, who is due to arrive in Jerusalem later Thursday at the start of a regional tour, will talk with high-ranking Jordanian officials about preparations for the peace conference, which is to be co-sponsored by Washington and Moscow, the source said.

The last time a Soviet foreign minister visited Jordan was on May 9. Pankin is also to visit Damascus this week.

Spain's Ordonez Pays 1-Day Visit, Holds Talks

JN1510205191 Amman Radio Jordan Network in Arabic 1900 GMT 15 Oct 91

[Text] Spanish Foreign Minister Francisco Fernandez-Ordonez left Amman following a short working visit of one day. During his visit, His Majesty King Husayn received him, and he met with Prime Minister Tahir al-Masri and Foreign Minister Dr. Kamil Abu-Jabir.

Dr. Abu-Jabir described the talks the Spanish minister held with His Majesty King Husayn and the prime minister as extremely successful.

In a joint press conference he held with the guest minister at Amman airport, Dr. Abu-Jabir said: The Jordanian-Spanish talks tackled all bilateral issues and means to enhance mutual cooperation between the two friendly countries, whose pillars are anchored by His Majesty King Husayn and His Majesty King Juan Carlos. The talks also tackled relations between Jordan and the European Community, in addition to the Middle East issue. Abu-Jabir also valued the Spanish foreign minister's concern to entrench his country's relations with Jordan, and his understanding of the Jordanian viewpoint with regard to bilateral cooperation issues and the Middle East issue.

For his part, Fernandez-Ordonez praised Jordanian-Spanish relations, and hoped to broaden the fields of political and economic cooperation between the two countries that are linked with ancient historical ties. He also praised Jordan's response to the peace process. He stressed the importance of Jordan's vital and basic role in rendering any political settlement of the region's crisis successful. Moreover, he valued the democratic process in Jordan and the democratic rule, while expressing satisfaction with Jordan's ability to pursue its democratic approach. He said cooperation between Jordan and the European Community is continuing, growing, and developing as days pass.

Media Urged To Help Improve Relations With Gulf

JN1610165791 Amman PETRA-JNA in Arabic 1515 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] Information Minister Mahmud al-Sharif received at his office today the chairman and members of the followup committee, emanating from the meeting, recently held in Amman under auspices of His Highness Prince Hasan, the crown prince, and organized by a number of Jordanians who had worked in the Gulf Cooperation Council states.

The committee briefed the minister on the resolutions and recommendations adopted by the meeting, and hoped that Jordanian media would make efforts to improve and deepen relations between Jordan and the Arab Gulf states in the interests of the two sides and in order to restore the fraternal relations to their previous level.

The minister emphasized his support for the committee's activities and urged its members to continue their good-will efforts with the aim of clearing the Arab air, which is something Jordan cares about, particularly in the circumstances the Arab nation is passing through, and that requires the closing of ranks and the efforts of all to restore Arab solidarity.

Statement Denies Request for Meeting With Baker

NC1710062491 Beirut Radio Lebanon in Arabic 0530 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Ambassador Yusuf Tanyus, director of the Foreign Minister's Office, has issued the following statement:

Foreign Minister Faris Buwayz had not asked to meet with his U.S. counterpart James Baker, contrary to a report broadcast by a private radio. The statement said that a request like this was not made by either Minister Faris Buwayz or by the government, because there are no grounds for holding such a meeting during James Baker's current tour of the region.

Details of U.S. Letter of Assurances Revealed

PM1710142191 London AL-HAYAH in Arabic 16 Oct 91 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Lebanon Receives U.S. Assurances Letter"]

[Excerpt] Beirut, AL-HAYAH—AL-HAYAH has been told by diplomatic sources that yesterday Lebanon received the U.S. letter of assurance, which includes assurances about implementing Resolution 425, separating it from Resolutions 242 and 338, and separating the Israeli withdrawal from the Syrian withdrawal.

A meeting was immediately held at the temporary presidential office—which included President Ilyas al-Hirawi, Prime Minister 'Umar Karami, and Foreign Minister Faris Buwayz—to assess the letter's content before the Council of Ministers meeting.

Prime Minister Karami had said in a brief statement that "Lebanon has actually received the U.S. assurances letter."

Minister Buwayz announced at the Foreign Ministry that he yesterday received a message from U.S. Ambassador Ryan Crocker on the final draft of the assurances letter. AL-HAYAH has learned from informed diplomatic sources that the draft includes the following:
—an assurance of separating the implementation of Resolution 425 from Resolutions 242 and 338.
—an assurance of the implementation of Resolution 425.
—an assurance of separating the Israeli withdrawal from the Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon, on the grounds that the mechanism for Israeli withdrawal was laid down by Resolution 425, whereas that for Syrian withdrawal was laid down by the al-Ta'if agreement, with a reference noting that the al-Ta'if accord stipulated stressing the withdrawal of all non-Lebanese forces from Lebanon.

Minister Buwayz also announced that his talks with Ambassador Crocker made him feel that the "peace conference will be convened very soon, probably before the end of the month if matters proceed as well as one could possibly wish." [passage omitted]

Fadlallah Will Meet Iran's Hashemi-Rafsanjani

NC1610131091 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1215 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] Minister Zahir al-Khatib and 'Allamah Muhammad Husayn Fadlallah left for Tehran today to attend a parliamentary conference on the Palestinian issue. Fadlallah will meet Iranian President Hashemi-Rafsanjani and other Iranian officials.

Hizballah Radio Reports Israeli Shelling

NC1810073291 (Clandestine) Voice of the Oppressed in Arabic to Lebanon 0630 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] The Zionist occupation troops have shelled several villages north of the occupied border strip. Intensive Israeli armored vehicle movement was also reported. Fresh troops are deployed in Lahd's positions opposite Hizballah positions to the south of the al-Biqa' Valley.

Our security correspondent in the south has informed us that the heights of al-Khalawat village and the heights of the central mountain came under fire yesterday from enemy tanks stationed in 'Ayn Qinya for approximately 30 minutes. Reports from the occupied border strip indicate that several armored vehicles have been brought to Hasbayya, including two Merkava tanks, three armored personnel carriers, and a number of jeeps. The Israeli shelling lasted until yesterday afternoon, though intermittently, targeting the central mountain and the vicinity of al-Khalawat and 'Ayn 'Ata and causing only property damage.

Junblatt Leaves for Tehran Palestinian Conference

NC1810065391 (Clandestine) Voice of the Mountain in Arabic to Lebanon 0530 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] Progressive Socialist Party [PSP] Leader Walid Junblatt has left for Tehran to attend a conference in support of the Palestinian issue. Junblatt is accompanied by Durayd Yaghi, his deputy for foreign affairs; Ghazi al-'Aridi, PSP commissioner for media affairs; and Chamber Deputy Ayman Shuqayr.

Baker, Al-Shar' Hold News Conference 16 Oct

JN1610222591 Damascus Syrian Arab Television Network in Arabic 2110 GMT 16 Oct 91

[News conference by Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar' and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker with unidentified reporters in Damascus on 16 October—recorded, in English with Arabic subtitles, processed from the English]

[Text] [Baker] Ladies and gentlemen, I will begin by saying that we have just concluded extensive and what I would characterize as positive talks with President al-Asad, Vice President Khaddam, and with Foreign Minister al-Shar' on the remaining issues necessary to launch this process. And I think that we have made the progress I thought was necessary when I arrived in Damascus yesterday.

For some time, I think Syria has been on the record as being in support of this process. In my view that has not changed; and President al-Asad reiterated to me his intention to participate in this process. Having said that, there is one issue having to do with the timing of the multilateral negotiations and on which there is a difference, and with respect to which we will continue to exchange views. But let me sum up the results or consequences of the two fairly long sessions which we had here in Damascus by saying that after these sessions, it is my view that we are still on course to hold a peace conference in this month, October.

[Al-Shar'] Well, let me say a few words on the atmosphere of the talks that Secretary Baker had yesterday with President al-Asad and today. Those talks were very long, very difficult.... [laughter]

[Baker] Not unusual, [word indistinct]. [laughter]

[Al-Shar'] But I can add that those talks were also positive and productive.

[Reporter] [Words indistinct] the letter of assurances in full now for the conference. Can you say that Syria now is fully ready to go to the conference, it says no problem to the American letter of assurances?

[Al-Shar'] Well, I can say that we discussed in depth the wording of the letter of assurances and we are satisfied with the results, with one exception, which is related to the multilateral negotiations on which we differ. And I can tell you why we had a different view on this. We believe that multilateral negotiations must be helpful to the peace process, must push the parties to have an outcome out of the peace conference. And that is why we believe it is not the right time to start multilateral negotiations at the outset of the peace conference or the negotiations, especially in the light of Israel's position, which is very well known to everybody all over the world; it is not positive, it is not constructive; it is intransigent. And until this moment, the statements are not helpful to achieve results.

That is why we want to test the Israeli intentions in the peace conference. And whenever there is genuine, substantial progress, I think the other regional issues, like water, like environment, arms control can be discussed by the other Arab states. And we hope that our brothers in the other Arab states who are not directly involved or concerned with the Arab-Israeli conflict will participate only after tangible and substantial results would come out from the peace conference.

[Reporter] [Words indistinct] understanding your explanation, may I ask you about the issues, though. Some of those issues, for instance, include Palestinian refugees and supposedly possible restrictions on weapon buildups in the Middle East. Is Syria prepared to stand aside while Palestinian refugees are being discussed? And, secondly, is Syria interested in restraints on weapons for Israel, for Syria, for other countries in the region?

[Al-Shar'] Yes, of course, we are very much concerned about these two important issues. On the first issue, the Palestinian refugees, we believe that to deal effectively with this issue, one has to reach results from the peace conference and the ensuing negotiations. We cannot deal with the refugees problem before and in isolation to the peace process. It is an important element in the peace process, which has to be addressed.

On the second issue, the arms race, it is very well known that peace in itself, when it is achieved and when our occupied lands are restored, then it is logical that the arms race in the region should be curbed. This is our view. I would like also to mention that as far as the mass destruction weapons is concerned, we have a proposal which we presented to the United Nations, and we are working with Egypt on this issue.

[Reporter] Mr. Minister, what is your understanding if the peace talks that follow the peace conference break down or hit a deadlock? Who will be the arbiter? Is there any higher authority, as the Syrian Government understands it, to broker, or mediate, or to appeal to if the talks hit a deadlock?

[Al-Shar'] Well, I can see that Secretary Baker's visits to the region—this is the eighth visit, I guess—and throughout all his discussions with us, and I suppose with the other Arab capitals, he pledged that the United States, which supports the implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the principle of land for peace, would work and push the peace process forward, as a co-sponsor with the Soviets, would be the driving force at the peace conference and during the talks. And in this case we are confident that we should reach results.

[Reporter] [Words indistinct] your position on the timing problem, is it the Syrian view that multilateral negotiations may not begin until after the bilateral negotiations conclude on some specific issue or any specific issues? And also, would you comment on the fact that Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, perhaps other states that I am not aware of today here, have already said they

would take part in those talks, apparently in contradiction with your call for them not to do so?

[Al-Shar'] Well, as I have just said, we in Syria believe the multilateral talks would help all the parties concerned if they come after achieving some genuine and tangible progress, concrete results.

[Reporter] [Words indistinct] Are you going to insist on, for example, on conclusion of the issue of the return of the Golan Heights before you agree to join the multilateral talks. Is that an example [words indistinct].

[Al-Shar'] What is important in this, as far as this point is concerned, is certainly we would like our occupied land to be restored by us [as heard] and all the other Arab occupied territories to be returned to the Arab side. This is the objective, in fact, of the peace process. And that is the only way to establish a just and comprehensive peace in the region.

[Reporter] Would you participate in the talks without conclusion to that issue, the multilateral one?

[Al-Shar'] As I have said, participating is something and our conviction is something else. We are unable to participate as long as those talks on the bilateral level do not bring results.

[Reporter] [Words indistinct] the bilateral talks yourself, even though these multilateral talks will go on, you are not saying that Syria won't participate in the bilateral talks with Israel if the multilateral talks start as they are scheduled with the Israelis and the other Arab states?

[Al-Shar'] If our position, if Syria's position, is not taken into consideration as far as the multilateral talks are concerned, then we would not participate in the multilateral talks.

[Reporter] (?You still) would participate in the bilateral talks even if Syria's position is not....

[Al-Shar', interrupting] Yes, this has nothing to do with that. In fact, we are saying that the objective of the conference is to achieve peace and not to talk about regional matters such as water, economy, environment, etc.

[Baker] Over here, you ask your question.

[Reporter] [Question indistinct]

[Baker] I am going to leave it right where I left it in my statement to you. There are some countries, as has just been stated here by a questioner, that want some multilateral discussions. The only difference between the United States and Syria on this question is a difference of timing, not a difference of whether or not there ought to be any multilateral talks. If there are countries that want multilateral talks and come together for that purpose, then I think there will be multilateral talks. But the point I think to make sure we do not lose sight of is that this is only one part of an overall process, and it is not the first, or even the second stage. First, we call for a peace conference, which we have every reason to believe Syria is still committed to and wants to attend and participate. Then we have bilateral negotiations with respect to the issue of peace. And it is thereafter that we have talked about the possibility of multilateral negotiations with the difference between us being one of when those negotiations should start. There will be further discussions with Syria. And there will be further discussions with countries that want those multilateral negotiations before that one discrete and specific issue is resolved. Yes, Warren?

[Reporter] [Words indistinct] peace conference, how do you handle this in your next stop?

[Baker] Well, what I will say is simply that the difference, to the extent that there is one, is one only of timing. There has never been an understanding with respect to exactly what the timing of those would be. I think that Israel probably is among those countries that would like to see the multilateral discussions. There are some Arab countries that have indicated an interest in that as well and we will talk with respect to all of these—we will talk to all of these countries about how we resolve the discrete issue of timing.

Let me say one other thing, I think the minister understands that we have a genuine and honest difference of view with respect to whether mulitlateral talks would be useful in the ongoing discussions relative to peace, or whether they wouldn't operate detrimentally. It is his view, the view of the Syrian Government, that it would be counterporductive. It happens to be our view that it would be productive, not unlike the situation that existed perhaps back in the seventies, when the United States and the Soviet Union were at each other's throats in a nuclear way and we began some initial talks on confidence-building measures, some tentative, very tentative steps on arms control. But that's an honest difference of opinion. They have their view, we have ours. The main thing here I would like for you to focus on is: We are moving down the road to see if we can bring the parties together in this month of October at a peace conference, to be followed by direct negotiations on the issue of peace. So we ought not to put the third stage of this process at the [word indstinct], we ought not stick up at the front and suggest that somehow a difference of opinion with respect to that would bar the other two stages because it won't.

[Al-Shar'] Let me first add to what Secretary Baker said in order to put you in much a clearer Syrian position as far as the mutilateral talks are concerned. The difference, in fact, is not between us and the United States, in principle, on this issue. Our major concern is coming from the fact that Israel wants, as it openly says, the Arabs—all the Arab countries—to talk with it and no land to be returned to the Arab side. That is our major concern. We are going to the peace conference to restore our occupied lands and to establish genuine peace in the region, and in this case we would be able to talk about everything dealing with the environment, with arms

race, with economy, with water, but not before, because in this case we would serve only the intention and the purpose of Israel. And, I am sure that the Arab countries wouldn't come forward to multinational, multilateral talks before they are sure that the Israeli intentions have been genuinely reversed.

[Baker] Can I make, let me make a statement before—Joanna, just a second. Let me make a statement in case somebody asks the question, maybe you won't. We are not talking about cities and we are not talking about dates.

[Reporter] [Word indistinct] are you willing to shake the hand of Foreign Minister David Levi of Israel and whether you would be willing to sit next to him?

[Al-Shar'] You are insisting on this question. [laughter] I will tell you, frankly, no, simply because this very hand is guilty. This very hand that you would like me to shake is very guilty because it is a hand which occupies our lands, ignores the Palestinian national rights, and for the last decades we have been suffering from this constant occupation, and the Palestinians in the occupied territories have been suffering from constant repression. So, why do you ask me to shake hands with those unless and until they prove that they are not guilty and that they comply with the international law and with UN resolutions.

[Reporter] We heard reports that the United States is going to drop from the letters of assurance which will be presented to Israel that it is committed to the principle of land-for-peace. Is this true?

[Baker] The policy of the United States is as President Bush stated it in his speech to the Congress on March the 6th of 1991, and that is that we believe that 242 means land-for-peace, or territory-for-peace.

[Reporter] Mr. Secretary, would you tell us some of the issues or any of the issues that you were able to resolve in these two days of meetings. We spent a lot of time on the issue that was resolved. What is it that you achieved while you have been here?

[Baker] We have spent a lot of time focusing—an awful lot of time—on the one issue with respect to which there remains a difference over timing. But we haven't spent any time on all of the myriad of issues that we did resolve—and there were lots of them.

'Full Text' of U.S. Assurances to Damascus Cited

PM1610155391 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 15 Oct 91 p 1

[Unattributed report: "AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT Publishes Text of U.S. Assurances Memorandum to Syria: Resolution 242 Applies To Golan and Washington Guarantees Border Agreement"]

[Text] Nicosia, AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT—The United States has emphasized to Syria that it regards Security Council Resolution 242 as applying to all fronts, including the Golan Heights. It has also expressed its willingness to play the role of guarantor of the security of "the borders to be agreed between Israel and Syria." This came in the U.S. assurances memorandum submitted to Syria by James Baker, a copy of whose full text AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT has obtained.

The U.S. memorandum says:

"The peace conference and subsequent talks must be based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.

"The conference's task is summed up in securing the holding of direct talks within two days after the opening of the conference, and multiparty talks on regional issues within two weeks. The process shall be conducted within the framework of two lines, the first represented by direct talks between Israel and the neighboring states, and the other by direct talks between Israel and the Palestinians.

"The United States intends to decisively endeavor to arrive at a comprehensive settlement to the Arab-Israeli dispute, and it is doing its utmost to continue the process in that direction along the two lines. And the United States does not support the linkage of the various forms of talks. In the interests of a comprehensive settlement, all negotiations must be conducted as quickly as possible in order to realize accord.

"The conference shall be held under U.S. and Soviet sponsorship, and it is possible to reconvene it with the approval of all the parties.

"The UN role shall be reflected in the secretary general's dispatch of his representative to the conference to attend as an observer. The United States and the Soviet Union shall inform the secretary general of the progress of negotiations. The agreements reached by the parties shall be be registered at the UN Secretariat, and the Security Council shall be informed of them. And the participating parties shall seek Security Council support for these proposals.

"As the United States takes account of all the parties' interest in the success of that process, it does not intend to support any counter- or parallel process in the UN Security Council while the process is proceeding actively.

"A final settlement can be attained only in accordance with mutual concessions during the course of the talks. And during the talks the United States will continue to insist that Security Council Resolution 242 and the "land for peace" principle are applicable to all fronts, including the Golan Heights.

"The United States does not intend to recognize or accept unilateral actions by Israel with regard to imposing its laws, domination, or administration on the Golan Heights.

"The United States will continue its opposition to Israel's activity regarding building settlements in the

territories occupied in 1967, as they remain an obstacle to the achievement of peace.

"The United States expresses its willingness to play the role of guarantor of the borders to be agreed between Israel and Syria.

"The United States will continue to play the role of mediator, working sincerely to resolve the Arab-Israeli dispute on the basis of understanding all the parties' needs and requirements. And it will remain, with the Soviet Union, the driving force for that process in order to help the parties to realize progress toward a comprehensive peaceful settlement.

"The United States and the Soviet Union express their willingness to be in constant contact with any party to the peace process at any time. And the United States is also willing to participate in the talks at any stage with the approval of the parties involved in the talks concerned."

Al-Asad, Lebanon's Al-Hirawi Chair Joint Council

JN1810071791 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 0415 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Excerpts] President Hafiz al-Asad and Lebanese President Ilyas al-Hirawi chaired the first meeting of the Syrian-Lebanese Supreme Council, which convened at the People's Palace at 1315 yesterday. [passage omitted]

At the end of the first meeting of the Syrian-Lebanese Supreme Council, the Syrian and Lebanese sides held an expanded round of talks. The meeting was attended, in addition to the members of the Supreme Council, by Dr. Salim Yasin, deputy prime minister for economic affairs; Minister of Agriculture Muhammad Ghabbash; Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar'; Transportation Minister Yusuf Ahmad; and Interior Minister Dr. Muhammad Harbah. On the Lebanese side, the meeting was attended by Foreign Minister Faris Buwayz, Agriculture Minister Muhsin Dallul, Economy Minister Marwan Hamadah, Interior Minister Sami al-Khatib, Minister of State for Transport Affairs Shawqi Fakhuri, and Foreign Ministry Secretary General Suhayl Shammas.

At the beginning of the Supreme Council meeting, the president welcomed President Ilyas al-Hirawi and Lebanese officials in the council. He described the Treaty of Brotherhood, Cooperation, and Coordination between the two countries as an historic act in the interest of both countries and the region as a whole. He said: The ratification of the provisions of the treaty and the developing relations between the two countries are in the interest of citizens in various material and moral aspects. The president affirmed the importance of continuing the common march. He said: Syria will always be ready to make sacrifices for the sake of Lebanon.

The Lebanese side valued the president's role in saving Lebanon from its ordeal and developing cooperation between the two countries. The Lebanese side said that what is happening between both countries is an example to be followed in terms of relations between two sisterly countries. The Lebanese side reiterated Lebanon's determination to continue the common march to deepen and develop relations of fraternity and cooperation between the two sides.

The Supreme Council reviewed Syrian-Lebanese relations since the signing of the treaty and the work achieved by the committees stemming from the Supreme Council in the economic and security fields. The Supreme Council praised the efforts made and the work achieved.

The Supreme Council instructed the common committees to continue work with the necessary speed to accomplish the missions entrusted to them.

The Supreme Council reviewed the situation in the region, the ongoing peace process, and the steps achieved toward the convening of the peace conference. The president informed the Supreme Council of the contacts which Syria held with all concerned parties to the peace process. He affirmed that Syria works for a just and comprehensive peace based on the UN resolutions.

President al-Hirawi informed the Supreme Council of the results of the visit to New York by the Lebanese presidential delegation, and Lebanese contacts to implement Security Council Resolution No. 425. He affirmed Lebanon's concern for strong cooperation with Syria in the interest of the two sisterly countries, and the interest of a just and comprehensive peace in the region.

The Supreme Council will resume its meetings today, Friday.

Last night, an official round of talks was held between the Syrian side, led by Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar', and the Lebanese side under Foreign Minister Faris Buwayz. The meeting was attended for Syria by Assistant Foreign Minister Yusuf Shakkur, and representing Lebanon was Foreign Ministry Secretary General Suhayl Shammas.

The two sides held consultations and discussed coordination on the peace process and international efforts to convene the peace conference.

Afghanistan

Hekmatyar's Faction Opposes Talks With Moscow

BK1610161491 Hong Kong AFP in English 1559 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] Islamabad, Oct 16 (AFP)—The Hezb-e Eslami, a powerful fundamentalist Afghan resistance faction, said Wednesday it would boycott talks in Moscow between mojahedin and the Soviet Union.

The faction, led by Golboddin Hekmatyar, objected to the venue of the talks and the Soviets' "behaviour"—an apparent reference to Moscow's reported expression of support for Afghan President Najibollah through its ambassador in Kabul.

Sebghatullah Mojaddedi, president of the rebel government-in-exile, had said here Monday that a mojahedin delegation would leave for Moscow later this month for Afghan peace talks.

In a statement released by the AFGHAN NEWS AGENCY (ANA), the Hezb-e Eslami said only a "strong and broad-based delegation" could represent the mojahedin "truly and honorably."

The statement warned Moscow against any attempt to "impose a government on Afghanistan in connivance with the United States and others."

The faction advocates continuation of the jihad, or holy war, to establish an Islamic government in Afghanistan by toppling the present Kabul regime.

Threatens Red Cross Over U.S. Hostages

BK1610131691 Lahore THE NATION (Islamabad Supplement) in English 16 Oct 91 p 1

[By Aslam Butt]

[Text] Islamabad- Hezb-e Eslami Afghanistan (Golboddin Group) a party of Afghan Guerrillas has threatened stern action against the representatives of the International Red Cross who are trying to negotiate the release of certain Americans made hostages by some groups of Mojahedin inside Afghanistan.

When contacted by THE NATION to enquire about the fate of the hostages a well placed source of the said party said, "We will have no objection if the efforts for the release are made by genuine representatives of the International Red Cross or any other agency helping us on humanitarian basis." He however alleged that these in fact were the CIA men.

"We tried our best to convince the party taking hostage the Americans to free them unconditionally after we were approached by some diplomats of United States. At the same time we have made it clear to the U.S. diplomats that we stood committed to fully resist any CIA sponsored move to make inroads into the Afghan territory and organisations waging jehad [holy war] against the aliens for more than a decade," the sources said.

India

Rao, Sharif Hold Long Private Talks

BK1710162491 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 1530 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] India and Pakistan have agreed to reduce tension between the two countries and decided to redouble their efforts to find a solution to the outstanding problems through negotiations. Our special correspondent Vivekanand Ray reports from Harare:

[Begin Ray recording] Another remarkable gain for India at Harare CHOGM [Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting], apart from the prime minister's speech at the executive session yesterday which has been praised by all, has been the prolonged meeting between Indian and Pakistani prime ministers this morning at the Sheraton Hotel, the venue of the CHOGM. Mr. Narasimha Rao and Mohammad Nawaz Sharif met over breakfast along with their senior Foreign Ministry officers for about half an hour. Then the officers left them alone to talk one-to-one without any aide for about 50 minutes. This has been the longest one-to-one talk between the prime ministers of India and Pakistan, even longer than the talk at Simla in 1972. Mr. Narasimha Rao and Mr. Nawaz Sharif say this has been a very good beginning to improve the Indo-Pakistan relations and to solve bilateral problems. [end recording]

Pakistan Asked To Stop Aiding Kashmir Militants

BK1610111891 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 0830 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] India has again asked Pakistan to stop abetting militants in Kashmir and abandon its pursuit of short-term gains through anti-Indian activities. The issue came up at a UN committee discussing right of people for self-determination where the Pakistani delegate chose to raise the Kashmir problem. The Indian delegate, Miss Shujata Mehta, made it clear that Kashmir is an integral part of India and charged that Pakistan is trying to protect the rights of terrorists who have indiscriminately killed innocent men and women. Giving statistics, she told the UN committee that last year alone, Pakistan-aided militants had killed 800 people. Miss Mehta also drew the committee's attention to the U.S. Congressman Mr. Stephen Solarz's statement that credible reports suggest that Islamabad is providing arms, training, and other support to the militants in Jammu and Kashmir.

Kashmir Infiltrations To Be Thwarted

BK1710064091 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 0245 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] The defense minister says Pakistan will not be allowed to succeed in its design of trying to push in

militants across the border in Jammu and Kashmir. Addressing a rally at Poona in Maharashtra, Mr. Sharad Pawar said the Army has been given strict instructions to shoot anyone coming from across the border. He said the vigilance on the international border has been tightened to defeat Pakistan's attempt to push in militants before the snowfall.

Leaders Condemn Blasts; Security Tight in Delhi

BK1710163891 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 1530 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Excerpts] In Uttar Pradesh, 42 persons were killed and more than 100 injured in two bomb explosions in Rudrapur Town of Nainital District last night. [passage omitted]

The president, Mr. Venkataraman, has condemned the Rudrapur bomb blast as a cowardly and senseless act. In a condolence message, Mr. Venkataraman extended his sympathies to the families of those who lost their lives in the tragic incident. He urged the people to exercise restraint in the face of provocations from those indulging in the cult of violence. The vice president, Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma, has expressed shock and grief over the killing of innocent persons. In a statement, he condemned bomb explosions as an outrage by the cowardly who violate the tenets of every religion.

The home minister, Mr. S.B. Chavan, has condemned the Nainital killings, describing it as part of a conspiracy guided from outside our borders to disturb communal amity. In a statement, expressing his sympathy to the bereaved families, Mr. Chavan has appealed to the people to maintain peace and defeat the designs of the terrorists.

Delhi police have sought the assistance of the National Security Guards [NSG] to tighten security during Dussehra [Hindu festival]. The commissioner of police, Mr. Arun Bhagat, told newsmen this evening that the NSG will be operating 10 additional patrol parties in the capital for the next three days. He said this is a precautionary measure in the wake of the Nainital bomb blast.

Meanwhile, the search for the kidnapped Romanian diplomat in New Delhi continues. A police spokesman, however, discounted reports of a link between the terrorists involved in yesterday's shoot-out in Connaught Place and the kidnappers.

Call for Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

BK1810083991 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 0730 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Text] India has called for total elimination of all nuclear weapons, missile technology, and the export market for conventional weapons. Speaking at the United Nations' committee, the member of the Indian delegation, Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee, said the world cannot rid itself of the threat of nuclear weapons without a change in the attitude of the nuclear powers. He said the only way to eliminate all nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons is to accept the action plan suggested by India to destroy these weapons in three phases spread over a period of 22 years.

Iran

Khamene'i Dismisses Mideast Peace Conference

LD1710140991 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1030 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Statement issued by Ayatollah Khamene'i, leader of the Islamic revolution and guardian of the Muslims' cause, on 17 October regarding Middle East peace conference—read by announcer]

[Excerpts] His Eminence Ayatollah Khamene'i, leader of the Islamic revolution and guardian of the Muslims' cause, has released a very important and strongly worded statement on the American-sponsored Middle East peace conference, in which he has exposed the conspiracies of criminal America and its paid agents. He has called on the Islamic ulema, writers, intelligentsia, students, and individual Islamic nations to mobilize their immense power to confront the mischievious plots by America and Israel. The text of the statement of the guardian of the cause of the Muslims is as follows:

In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful. [passage omitted] There are moments in the history of nations when the nature of decisions leave a long-lasting impact on the life of those nations. Posterity may view such decisions as bringing either bitterness, agony, and slavery, or freedom, honor, and happiness.

If, on the day when the Zionists began to strike the first blow at the deep roots of the Palestinian nation in an effort to transplant a false, forged, and rootless nationality in the soil belonging to the Muslims, the Muslim leaders and effective elements, in line with the the masses of the people, showed a serious and intelligent presence and resistance, then today in this region there would be no trace of the misery and calamity that are the poisonous fruits of the damned tree that is the Zionist state. Indeed, perhaps the nations of the region, in particular the oppressed Palestinian nation, woud have been spared the agonies they have suffered during the past 45 years. [passage omitted]

The treason of allowing the birth of Israel brought in its wake other treasons. What damage such waves of treasons brought about—virtues destroyed, high morale killed, and flames extinguished. Any person who could have done something or taken a step on that day to prevent that great injustice—and yet failed to do so—will be condemed by the cursing damnation of these two generations of Palestinians. Such persons will also be subject to very decisive and harsh judgment by contemporary and future histories, and will have to pay heavily on the divine judgment day. In sharing such a fate there

is no distinction between the men of politics and men of economics, or men of culture and literature and men of fighting.

Today, once again, another fateful moment is imminent, and another trial is at hand. The point is that, in the midst of what are termed post-cold war victories—which have been gained thanks to the scared silence prevailing in some countries in the region—and by relying on its extortionist military presence, America intends to solve its own problem and that of the usurping Zionists, to have Israel recognized by the Arabs, and once and for all put an end to the issue of Palestine.

Ridding Israel of the encumbrance of opposition by Arab governments would primarily enable that pet of America to see to its main duty—fighting Islamic movements in the region—which are the most serious threat to America. Second, it would establish America's influence over the countries in this vital region, turn the region into a safehaven for Americans, and the Great Satan would become the undisputed ruler of the Middle East. Third, Israel would capture another important trench as part of its plans, and its Nile-to-Euphrates dream, to expand the occupied lands.

The enemy intends to tear Palestine away from the heart of the Muslim world and establish the cursed tree of Zionism in the home of the Muslims. By establishing the occupying regime, America intends to take control of the fate of everyone in this sensitive area and free itself from the worry of the Islamic uprising in the Middle East and Africa. The enemies of Islam intend to vent all their grudges against Islam and make up for all the defeats they have suffered in the past few years as a result of the awakening of the Muslims.

This incident is not comparable to any of the conspiracies hatched with regard to the Middle East over the past few years. Here they talk of usurping a country, making a nation homeless forever, and ultimately separating a part of the world of Islam and the geographic center of the great Islamic homeland and the lofty mecca of the Muslims.

At this dangerous juncture, the world's Muslims should be aware of their duty. They should realize their responsibility as Muslims. On the one hand, it is our duty to defend Islamic lands—it is a must in Islamic jurisprudence—and, on the other hand, to respond to the supplication of a meek nation. As the Prophet—peace and God's mercy be upon Him and His clan—said: Anyone hearing and not heeding the plea for help of a Muslim is not a Muslim. Today, not just one person, but a nation has called for help.

Today, Muslim governments should be aware of their duty. United, they would be mightier than America. America's need for this region is greater than this region's need for America. The governments should know that the Muslim nations wish to jointly say no to the arrogant wishes of America and Israel. That is the surest way to safeguard those governments and the honor and integrity of Islamic countries.

They should not be frightened of America's threats and Zionist media propaganda pressure, and respond to the call of their Islamic and national duty. Muslim nations should know that they are as responsible to God and history as the governments. You could assist and force the governments to resist the pressure from Arrogance, and you could pose a serious threat to governments shirking that responsibility.

You, Islamic scholars, writers, free thinkers, and students in Muslim countries have more urgent responsibilities. You could inform the nations of the vastness of the calamity designed for the world of Islam by America and Israel, and mobilize the huge national forces to combat them. Governments preparing themselves to cooperate with that treachery should beware of the threat of the wrath of their own nations.

The focal point of this sensitive and dangerous struggle is the meek and brave Palestinian people who have fully grasped the problem and, by relying on Islam, have posed a great threat to the enemy with their life and death struggle inside their usurped homeland. The great arrogant conspiracy is to quash that struggle. But with God's blessings, the endeavor of the brave Palestinians, with the assistance of Muslim nations and governments, like a flame shall become stronger every day until it engulfs of the enemy's house of straw. That will happen and God's victory will be theirs. [passage omitted]

The enemy should know that no threat or ploy such as involving those Palestinians who have turned their backs on the ideals of Palestine in the American conference would make those pious individuals, who consider jihad to liberate Palestine their Islamic duty, forsake that rightful struggle. Despite the specific wishes of America and its subordinates and puppets, the jihad of the Palestinian nation will continue and that holy flame will not be put out by the treachery of the puppet Arab and Palestinian statesmen.

The most important defense against America's plot lies inside the occupied lands and in the strong hands of the Palestinian combatants. However, all Muslims are duty-bound to take part in that jihad and help them financially, politically, militarily, and with intelligence and equipment. The Palestinian nation must not feel alone. The Zionists and those who are attributed with torturing and killing Palestinian fighters should not feel safe in any part of the world. Support funds and assistance cells for the struggling Palestinians should be set up all over the world by governments and nations.

Imposing economic sanctions on the usurping government and not recognizing it is the duty of all Muslim governments. Nations should take note of this issue. The current conspiracy should be fought against and its repercussions prevented with such means and with all

other possible means. The Palestinian issue has only one possible solution—the formation of a Palestinian government in all of Palestine.

I pray for God's guidance and help for all Muslim governments and nations and for the continuation of their hopes and victory. Peace be upon good subjects of God.

[Signed] 'Ali al-Hoseyni al-Khamene'i

[Dated] 17 October 1991

Khamene'i Addresses IRGC

LD1610170691 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1030 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Speech by Ayatollah 'Ali Hoseyni Khamene'i, leader of the Islamic revolution and commander in chief of the Armed Forces, at meeting with personnel at base of the Ground Forces of the Islamic Revolution Guard Corps; date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate. My unlimited thanks to the great God who has given the best chidren of the revolution the chance to perform their serious duty in defense of the loftiest divine truth in contemporary times.

God's greatest blessing to us is that He created us at a time and placed us in an age when we are able to struggle on the path of the great Islamic aspirations and be hopeful, indeed be certain, of success. [passage omitted]

Today all paths are open to us, the offspring of the present era; today the vista is open, the future is full of hope and the resources needed to defend the oppressed divine and Islamic values are at our disposal. That is God's great blessing which we must cherish. [passage omitted]

Islam was alive year after year, but it was not present on the scene of the fundamental activities of the world. For a long period Islam was isolated from ruling establishments which were Muslim in name only, establishments which were alien to Islam. [passage omitted]

And when the era of Western and European progress arrived two or three centuries ago, and when materialistic values held sway over the world in different ways, Islam and Muslims sank fully into isolation and desertion. They even tried to force the name of Islam into oblivion; they tried to separate the Islamic countries even from their superficial Islam through atheistic and non-Islamic ideas. [passage omitted]

For God's promise that Islam would triumph over all infidelity and apostasy and that divine values would triumph over materialism it was necessary for Islam to stand up and be counted on the arena of life. The great God decided that such a great feat would be achieved by the hands of one of His most competent and most superior of His subjects. And that was done. [passage omitted]

Thus, Islam arrived on the scene; it stood up to be counted. At first nobody took it seriously; but soon after they learned of its danger they began to hatch plots against it. One of those plots was the eight-year war. But the efforts of this faithful nation, the disciples of the school of faith who benefited from that competent person's teachings and you faithful youth made it possible for you to come out of this test in full force to make your revolution and your Islam even more glorious. [passage omitted]

Today, in the aftermath of the end to the two camps of arrogance in the world, when the arrogant and materialistic powers are adopting seemingly the same path, eyes are fixed on this 1,400-year old hero which has arisen again. It has rid itself of the dust of the time, it come to the scene, and has declared to the world its mission; and it has stood against materialist powers with full force. That is, the standard of Islam and its great standard bearer which is the great Iranian nation. [passage omitted]

The Palestinian nation today has cast its eyes on you; victimized Muslim nations and the Muslim intelligentsia are looking up to you. Even those who have not known Islam cherish hopes from you in their hearts. That is the launch pad from which the Islamic nations must move. This is a great task which requies faith, reliance on God, will power, and spiritual and material preparedness. Today we the Iranians carry a responsibility which has been entrusted to us and this is a responsibility greater than any other we have had to carry before in our history.

Today the eyes of the world are watching us and are concerned about us. Almighty God has put this responsibility before us. If God forbid we neglect this reponsibility, the burden of this responsibility will not go away; and Almighty God will select other more worthy and more deserving nations to carry this burden of trust. However, our nation with so many martyrs, with so much successful endeavor behind it, and after showing so much sincerity in its faith and loyalty to God and the saints of God, is the most deserving nation to shoulder this heavy burden of responsibility.

Today the United States, in the wake of its superficial victories in the political arena of the world and in the unequal arena of the war against the defeated and abject regime of Iraq, is proud of its imaginary victories. But despite this pride, the leaders of arrogance are beset with strong fear and anxiety; and this is a fear from Islam only. They do not wish to confess to this fear, lest they should attach some importance to Islam, the revolution, and the Islamic uprising in their remarks. But despite their wish, what is in their hearts comes to the surface; and it becomes clear that they are very frightened of the deep Islamic movement.

The treachery that is committed in connection with Israel in the holy land of Palestine and in favor of the usurping regime of Israel today, is in fact a move and a plan to confront the Islamic movement in the region. They are in haste to strengthen their foothold in the region, so as to enable them to halt the Islamic uprising of the nations. But will they succeed?

On the surface they might sit and discuss the issue of Palestine. But it would be impossible for the enemies of the Islamic nation and the great Islamic ummah to achieve this big conspiracy, contrary to the wishes of the Muslim nations. The problem of Palestine will not be solved in this way. The struggle and jihad will remain with much greater enthusiasm. And you should know that the conspiracies which have been aimed at the Iranian nation and the Islamic Republic since the early days of the revolution will remain. They are afraid of the revolution. They are afraid of you; and this makes it necessary for us to be alert.

The Islamic Revolution Guard Corps [IRGC] went through a great test in defending the revolution and the Koran. It is the cause of your pride. The Ground Forces of the IRGC created the most beautiful scenes in the bloody battlefields of the war and has filled its annals with the most brilliant pages. You dear and devoted young men; you commanders and all of you who spent the best years of your youth undergoing the most difficult experiences in the holy and bloody defense, you should increase your preparedness day by day.

You should not imagine that since there is seemingly no war there is no conspiracy on the part of the enemy. Not one moment of negligence is permissible. Strengthen the spiritual potential of the IRGC. Strengthen faith, piety, and attention to God. Do not forget the tears of enthusiasm and affection on the altar of worship. Do not forget prayers, benedictions, and repentance. This is our life; this is the life of our hearts; this is the essence of our true victories. Give greater importance to dicipline and order, which are essential conditions for the capabilities of any military organization—and today, God be thanked, I have observed very interesting displays of these; I have witnessed them. Take into account, one by one: military training, drills, military drills, different maneuvers, your military supremacy and progress; training in all ranks and levels and organizational strength. This is how you should administer and strengthen the Corps. Try to continue to maintain this blessed organization, the IRGC, as a revolutionary organization in keeping with its birth as a revolutionary organization moving along the path of the objectives of the revolution.

May the holy soul of the imam of the ummah be happy with you, and may the blessings of our great hidden imam be upon you. Maintain the unity of the Armed Forces. Move along the same path as the army and the law enforcement forces with utmost fraternity and generosity. They each have a task and responsibility and path to follow toward their own completion; they should all follow that path. Go forward—God willing—and be sure that the Almighty will assist you. May God's peace and blessings be upon you.

IRGC Supports Confrontation of Israel

LD1710115191 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1030 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] On the eve of the International Conference of Support for the Islamic Revolution of Palestine in Tehran, the Islamic Revolution Guard Corps [IRGC] has issued a statement calling for decisive and unified confrontation and the adoption of the principled resolutions of that conference regarding the usurper and Jerusalem-occupying regime.

In its statement, the IRGC declared its readiness to assist Hizbollah resistance cells and Palestinian revolutionaries in the struggle against the Jerusalem-occupying regime.

President Sees 'Contradiction' in U.S. Policy

LD1110174291 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1130 GMT 11 Oct 91

[Second Friday prayers sermon by President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani at Tehran University on 11 October—live or recorded]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Another important international and regional issue which I would like to raise is that of Palestine and the problem of Israel, particularly the Israeli aggression against the airspace of a number of Arab countries. I have, of course, dealt with that issue in my Arabic sermon, but I will say just a few words about it in my Persian sermon.

The Israelis, in a very bitter incident, became so brazen as to violate the airspace of four Arab countries in one fell swoop, and no one responded. Not a single missile was fired in their direction and we have not seen the appropriate reaction to it.

That was a very degrading and ugly incident for the Islamic world community. Unfortunately, that incident occurred just at the threshold of the alleged peace conference. This means Israel is telling people—telling Arabs, telling Muslims, telling the world—that it is so brazen that it does not need peace. Or Israel is telling them that you Arab countries are in such a condition that we can fly over your head whenever we like, and therefore you must come and grant concessions.

Now, once again, the Israelis have violated another international law; they have invaded East Jerusalem and they have forcibly expelled a number of Arabs and Muslims from their homes in order to settle Zionists in their place. This is another blatant act of aggression being carried out by them.

We blame America for those actions. If the Americans did not support Israel, did not cherish and support it, then these incidents would not have taken place.

The Islamic world will not forget these issues. Every single Muslim will record those events in their hearts in order to produce the appropriate response to both Israel and America at the proper time. [crowd chants "God is great," "Khamene'i is the leader," "Death to America," "Death to Israel"]

I think the Americans are committing a fundamental strategic mistake if they intend to get concessions for Israel from the Arabs, because they think—it is with this thought in mind—that through this action they will resolve the Middle East problem and Israel's life will become normal with the signatures of several governments, and she will become legitimate and like a normal government, just like the rest of the governments, and they will live next to each other.

They are definitely mistaken. Anyone who looks at history and studies history will realize that this is a mistake. If, for example, the governments of five or 10 states sat down and signed an agreement, will the 1.2 billion Muslims in the world accept that? Will they accept the signatures? The Muslims may or may not say something. Today it does not matter if they say something or not. But they definitely do not accept this.

How can several million—for instance, five or four million—Zionists [as heard], feel secure in the middle of 1.2 billion Muslims, and rest assured that they have now been recognized? How can this be?!

You can see that in Yugoslavia they held them together with something for 50 years, and now that there has been an opening there, everyone is standing up and saying: I want my own state. You can see that the Baltic states were part of the Soviet Union and that they are now seceding in such a way and are sacrificing their blood for their ideals.

How can you take away the first altar of the Muslims and hand it to the Jews, the Zionists? The most revered shrine on earth, the cradle of the prophets, is to be taken away from the Muslims and handed over to those who have killed so many human beings and committed so many tyrannies and who will do so again? And they will be impudent. The people's feelings....[changes thought] Is there an end to it?!

America has set aside 1.2 billion people, plus all those in the Third World who agree with them, for a few million Zionists. What kind of a poor deal is that? How big a mistake is it? Perhaps their justification is that Western public opinion wants it so? Yes, Western public opinion is like that at present, but who created this public opinion? It was you yourselves. Public opinion would not accept such a big issue so easily. It was you who made it so trivial for your people. You should put this right through your media and other facilities. If you pursue this criminal course of action and take the rights of the oppressed and homeless Palestinians, give them to people who have jobs in the Soviet Union—as doctors, engineers, and factory owners—and bring them in from there and tell them to take the place of the homeless Arabs and live here, the world will not accept it.

There is a contradiction in your course of action. On the one hand, you say: We are moving towards democracy and human rights. All right, we will assume that you are sincere. If it became democratic there, if the people in Arab countries became free, if all Arab governments were elected tomorrow—that is what you claim to be after—then will there be anyone who would accept the signatures under the peace agreement? Would the nations accept those signatures then? You are either lying and do not want democracy, or you cannot force Israel, because you know the two do not go together.

If it became democratic, Israel could not be forced on the people, and if it is a case of putting your puppets in power and obtaining their signatures, then that may be possible for now but it is a very makeshift situation, like the embers under the ashes. Muslims and honest people in the world will never reconcile themselves to this injustice of yours. [crowd chants "God is great," "Death to America, Britain, and Israel," and "God save Khamene'i and Hashemi-Rafsanjani"] [passage omitted]

Baker's 'Disappointment' With Syria Viewed

LD1810000291 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1106 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] U.S. Secretary of State James Baker left Damascus for Jerusalem yesterday after completing three stages of difficult negotiations with Syrian leaders. He tried to portray the talks with Syrian leaders as successful in a news conference before leaving Damascus. He could not, however, hide his disappointment in not attracting Syria's acceptance to participate in the third stage of the peace conference. Baker's visit to Syria took place within the framework of preparing the region's countries for participation in the Middle East peace conference, due to take place at the end of October. [passage omitted]

Syria believes that Israel's participation in the regional conference—in the third phase of the peace sessions—is a concession which the United States is giving to the Zionist regime because these sessions will provide Israel with the golden opportunity to normalize her relations with the region's countries. There is no guarantee whatsoever that by the time that the regional sessions are convened the bilateral and direct talks—in the second phase—would have reached any tangible results and that Israel would have agreed to withdrawing from the occupied Golan, West Bank, and Gaza Strip regions and that she would have agreed to recognize officially the Palestinians' legitimate rights. In this respect, the Syrian leaders believe that the condition for convening the

regional conference is that progress should be made in the second phase of the peace conference. Hence, they call for a change in the timetable of the peace conference's phases.

The difficult, 13-hour negotiations between al-Asad and Baker did not conclude with an agreement. Syrian Foreign Minister Faruq al- Shar' announced at the end of these negotiations that Syria would not only not participate in the regional sessions in the third phase of the Middle East peace session, but also would try to persuade other countries to refrain from participating. [passage omitted]

Syria's stand has much of its roots in the declared highly uncompromising stand adopted by the Zionist regime, which keeps declaring that it will not withdraw from the occupied territories, including the Golan Heights. [passage omitted]

Baker is currently trying to lessen the importance of Syria's stand in the peace talk trends, and he has said that the third phase of the peace sessions—in the event that other countries agree—will take place without Syria. Diplomatic circles believe that over the past few years, Syria was always a country that opposed peace talks with the Zionist regime, and was the hardest obstacle to overcome in the conduct of the negotiations. It is natural that Syria cannot easily give up the valuable achievements of its past resistance. Certainly, the price that the Arabs will pay in the peace negotiations will be, by any account, more than the harm they may suffer if they did not participate in the peace negotiations. Will Arab governments, in several days of negotiations, give the Israeli regime as a gift all the concessions which the latter has not been able to achieve over the past 40 years?

Pakistan

Foreign Minister Interviewed on Regional Issues

PM1710142991 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 16 Oct 91 p 5

[Interview with Pakistani Foreign Minister Nawaz Sharif by Khalil Matar in New York; date not given]

[Excerpts] [Matar] It seems that the Afghanistan issue is in the forefront of the issues expected to be resolved soon. So what has been achieved?

[Sharif] Let me first give you a simple rundown on what will take place shortly. The UN secretary general submitted a set of proposals. There are three fundamental points among his five points: First, to stop arming the two sides. Second, the need to draw up a transitional-period mechanism to enable the Afghan people to choose the ones they want. Third, implementation of a cease-fire. [passage omitted] We are currently trying to make the best efforts in cooperation with Iran to bring about a kind of consensus among the the various groups of Afghan mujahidin. A mujahidin delegation is currently in New York meetings with many of the delegations participating in the UN General Assembly session. Moscow has invited a delegation from the masses [al-jamahir] to visit it. So we are optimistic. Our principled position on that question is that we want a political solution. It is regrettable that force should replace negotiations. [passage omitted]

[Matar] Let us move to the Kashmir question. How is the situation there today?

[Sharaf] The situation there is very tragic. It is shameful that a time when the world is moving toward peace the people of that province, which is occupied by India, should suffer from occupation and persecution as a result of the presence of nearly 500,000 soldiers or policemen there. Over 5,000 women and children have been killed there so far.

The cause of the suffering is clear; the UN Security Council adopted a resolution which should be properly implemented. It gives the Kashmir people, through a referendum, the freedom to choose to stay with either India or Pakistan. But that choice has not been offered to the people in Kashmir, despite the fact that the Pakistani Government and the Indian Government agreed to it.

As you know, we went to war in 1970 and 1972, after which the leaders of the two countries decided to tackle that question bilaterally, without Pakistan abandoning its position of demanding a referendum in accordance with the UN resolution.

Our position in the new Pakistani Government is that we should negotiate with the Indian Government in order to resolve that problem. [passage omitted]

[Matar] Why does India not respond to your appeals?

[Sharaf] The time has come for them to understand the realities. We heard here at the United Nations, as did others, that that area is a disputed area and not an Indian area which is not in dispute. At the same time India cannot control it. For 22 months the area has been witnessing battles and problems, and India is not allowing in observers; nor is it allowing reporters to move their cameras to the area—which means there is something they want to hide from the world. This is clear. Now we see that public opinion in India and some writers and journalists are writing on the issue and demanding that the Indian Government look into the question and work to resolve it in accordance with the Security Council resolution. [passage omitted]

[Matar] There are people who from time to time stir up the question of Pakistan's possession of a nuclear reactor. Can you explain the position on that?

[Sharaf] Let us be clear: The aims of Pakistan's nuclear program are peaceful. We submitted proposals in June of this year that representatives from the United States, the

Soviet Union, China, India, and Pakistan meet to discuss turning the region of south Asia as a whole into a region free from disputes and to calm matters down for the sake of development.

China expressed its willingness to do this and the Americans welcomed the idea. And after the recent developments I hope that the Soviets will be positive. It is India alone which is refusing. We have no bad intentions, but the question of our survival is the basis, and we take this into account, and we will not hesitate for one single second to halt our programs if India agrees [as published]. We want India to be secure just as we want Pakistan to be secure.

[Matar] But it seems that in this age security does not depend on nuclear weapons.

[Sharaf] Yes. Our programs have peaceful aims only, but there is a state which possesses these capabilities and wants to deny a neighboring state that capability. What we are saying is that the world as a whole should know that India possesses these capabilities and that we hope that our prime minister's proposal will realize his objective of making the entire region free from nuclear weapons.

Islamabad Working on Caretaker Afghan Government

BK1610133391 Karachi DAWN in English 16 Oct 91 p 1

[By Shaheen Sehbai]

[Text] Islamabad, Oct 15—Pakistan is working strenuously to forge a caretaker government in Afghanistan comprising leaders who would not be candidates for any office later, informed sources said on Tuesday.

"In view of the serious divisions within the Afghan mojahedin groups, we are looking for an Afghan 'Jatoi' [former Pakistani premier] so that he can quietly disappear from the scene once elections are over," they said.

Secretary-General of the Foreign Affairs, Akram Zaki, returned to Islamabad on Tuesday evening after a long session of talks with mojahedin leaders in Peshawar on the same lines, the sources said.

They said the divisions between mojahedin leaders were so sharp that it was difficult to find a person who would accept the leadership of anyone else and thus need had been felt to set up a caretaker government.

"This government would be easier to form as it would be known from day one that none of its members would be looking for any office later", sources said.

Once such an agreement is reached between mojahedin leaders, the caretaker government would go to Moscow for talks with the Soviet leaders.

Pakistani officials feel the chances for real progress in the intra-Afghan talks were now bright as the Soviets were showing a very flexible attitude and the idea of a totally unambitious caretaker government was being liked by important leaders.

Sources said the real stumbling block to the forging of a previously planned interim government was the Hezb-e Eslami of Mr. Golboddin Hekmatyar who had threatened all mojahedin groups not to join any government in which people with their hands drenched in blood were sitting.

"Prof. Sebghatollah Mojaddedi, who had agreed to become the head of the interim government in his meeting with the UN Secretary General in New York, had taken a U-turn in Pakistan because of the Hekmatyar threats", sources revealed.

Hekmatyar, was quoted by the AFGHAN NEWS AGENCY as saying on Monday that both the United States and Soviet Union "wanted to establish a shura [consultative council] of 150 stooges under their direct supervision to provide an umbrella for launching an imposed system of Afghanistan".

He warned against such an attempt and said if foreign troops were sent into Afghanistan under the pretext of UN peace keeping force, Afghanistan would turn into another Lebanon with all its military and political implications.

Hekmatyar also warned Pakistan and Iran that "if Afghanistan was in turmoil, the flames of war there can also reach these neighbouring countries. If we are in peace, the whole region would be in peace", he was quoted as saying.

UN Delegates Exchange Remarks on Kashmir

BK1610162391 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network in Urdu 1500 GMT 16 Oct 91

[Text] Pakistan has called upon the international community to exert pressure on India to stop using force in occupied Kashmir, so that the Kashmiri people may exercise their right of self-determination. Addressing the UN General Assembly's Social Committee, Pakistani delegate Mir Zafarullah Khan Jamali expressed the hope that India would realize the fact that it cannot suppress the aspirations of the people of Jammu and Kashmir through coercion and oppression.

Reacting to Jamali's statement, the Indian delegate claimed that Jammu and Kashmir was an integral part of India and the principle of self-determination did not apply to that state.

Another Pakistani representative Mukhtar Hussain challenged India's claim and asserted that Kashmir was a disputed territory and had never been an integral part of India. He said any assertion contrary to this would be tantamount to denying the legal status of the UN Security Council resolutions.

Rejecting the allegations that Pakistan was involved in terrorism in occupied Kashmir, the Pakistani delegate said the only form of terrorism that prevailed there were the barbaric crimes being committed by Indian forces against innocent Kashmiris.

Sri Lanka

LTTE Leaders Admit Group 'Disintegrating'

BK1710120891 Colombo Sri Lanka Broadcasting Corporation International Service in English 1045 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] The LTTE [Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam] leadership has in a series of public meetings in Jaffna admitted that the Tigers are disintegrating. This is due to the heavy beating which the terrorists have taken recently at the hands of the Sri Lankan security forces at Elephant Pass and Weli Oya and an increasing lack of support from Tamils both in Sri Lanka and abroad. Reports reaching LANKAPUVATH from Jaffna state that the LTTE treasurer, addressing a public meeting at the Arali Mahavidyalaya [College] in Jaffna earlier this week, had complained bitterly that Tamils living abroad had shown great reluctance in supporting the Eelam cause and as a result, the LTTE's funds were fast drying up. The deputy leader of the political wing of the LTTE, Yogaratnam Yogi, who this week addressed a meeting of university students, lecturers, and school teachers in Jaffna, stated that the LTTE was experiencing an acute shortage of manpower and funds. He complained that Tamil youths, unlike in the past, were refusing to join the ranks of the Tigers and unwilling to sacrifice their lives for the Eelam cause. Yogaratnam Yogi had also admitted that the Tigers were fighting an uphill battle against the Sri Lankan security forces.

According to the LTTE, those killed at Weli Oya included 60 officers and 55 women cadres. Reports from Jaffna say that according to a clandestine LTTE radio broadcast, the LTTE has also lost 567 cadres killed in action in Elephant Pass and 1,500 seriously wounded.